THE FALL OF BABEL.

By the confusion of Tongues, directly prooving against the Papistes of this, and former ages; that a view of their writings and Bookes, being taken, it cannot be discerned by any man liuing, what they would say, or how be vnderstood, in the question of the sacrifice of the Masse, the Reall presence or Transubstantiation; but in explaning their mindes, they fall vpon such tearmes, as the Protestants vse and allow.

FVRTHER:

In the question of the Popes Supremacie is shewed, how they *abuse an authoritie of the auncient Father S. Cyprian, a Canon of* the 1. Niceen: counsell, and the Ecclesiasticall historie of Socrates, and Sozomen: And lastly is set downe a briefe of the succession of Popes in the sea of Rome, for these 1600. yeares togeather: what diuersitie there is in their accompt, what heresies, schismes, and intrusions there hath been in that sea, delivered in opposition against their Tables, wherewith now adayes they are very busie, and other thinges discouered against them.

By

IOHN PANKE.

2. Sam: 3. 1.

There was long warre betweene the house of Saul and the house of Dauid: but Dauid waxed stronger, and the house of Saul waxed weaker.

Printed at Oxford by Ioseph Barnes, and are to be sold by Iohn Barnes dwelling neere Holborne Conduit. 1613.

A. b. 153.

Printed at Oxford by Joseph Barnes, and are to be
sold by John Barnes dwelling neere Holborne
Conduit. 1593.

and Reuerend in Christ, M. D. A. the heads of Colledges, and companies of students in the Vniuersitie of Oxford; And their Colleagues, and associates, against the common aduersarie, in the Vniuersitie of Cambridge; and all other publike defenders of the true christian religion, within this his Maiesties Realme of great Britaine: Iohn Pancke *wisheth grace and peace from God the Father, and from our Lord Iesus Christ.*

I Haue read it reported (Reuerend Fathers and Brethren) that it was the fortune of *Aulus Albinus*, to bee reprehended by *Cato* the censor, because being a Romane, and writing his historie in Greeke, he did seemeto aske pardō, if he did therin amisse, whē with lesse adventure hee might haue kept himselfe from all fault in not medling with such a businesse at all. My case at this time is euen as his in this matter taken in hand; I would both adventure it, & will also praie your pardons, if I haue either done amisse, in medling with a businesse, that beelongeth to right approued schollers, or haue not proceeded so soundly against the aduersaries, as the waight of these questions doth requier. My defence in both cases is by waie of excuse; for seeing I haue for some fewe yeares past, bin conuersāt in al your writings that J could harken out to be printed against the adversaries, to whom rather shoulde J giue an account, then vnto you, either of the profit I haue made by them to ouerthrowe the contrarie part or incite you to continue yet your further labours to

Reyn. in the beeginning of his 6. conclusions. And also in his apology of them.

Quid opus est vt properes periculum suscipere condemnationis loquēdo, cum tacēdo possis esse tutior. Ambro. offic. l. 1. c. 2.

the building vp of the ſpirituall houſe of the Lord, and better accompliſh, al I could doe, & that by this kinde of dedication? The truth hath ſpokē it, we ſhall render an account for euerie idle word; and ſo ſhal we for our idle ſilence. J freely confeſſe vnto you al, that next the booke of God, your volumes and treatiſes haue eſpecially tied mee at home, when ſome other my companions haue bin walking abroad. The holy truth, which in your conſciences you knowe you doe vphold, is the waightieſt aſſurance of well doing that maie bee; The conſent of nations & Churches abroad is a great motiue to pricke you forward; but when by the particular travel of any on man, it may alſo appeare, that hauing had your writings tried by the Canō of holie ſcripture and ſome antiquitie elſe, & hauing it found that there is a true *Diapaſon*, & concord in al your voices, in arguing the truth of the Lords cauſe, this to bee teſtified by others that are of the Laitie, as children ioining with you Fathers, wil J ſuppoſe bee noe ſmal ioie and gladneſſe vnto you. *Macte virtute.* Go forward J beeſeech you with good courage, the aduerſarie is inſolēt but verie weake, *iam profecto ab anicul is quas contemnunt, & à pueris noſtratibus error illorum ac ſtultitia irridetur.* euen of old wiues and yong children which they moſt contemne, is their verie religion derided. They can tel now as wel as their teachers that their religion is dumbe, as done vnto ſtockes and blockes, and alſo is idle as beeing placed in the hande and fingers, ſcarcelie comminge into the tongue, but neuer into the heart, as the auncient father *Lactantius* ſaith by the Gentiles, which aptly ſheweth the vanitie of theirs

Illuſtres & præſtantes viri diſcipulorum cer taminibus, nō minus quā ſuis vincunt. Amb. offic. l. 1. c 41.

Si pro otioſo verbo reddemus rationem videamus ne reddamus pro otioſo ſilentio Amb. offic. l. 1. c 3.

Lactant. inſtit. lib. 5. c. 20. fol. 465.

Illa enim religio muta eſt, non tantū quia mutorum eſt ſed quia ritus eius in manu & digitis eſt nō in corde aut lingua ſicut noſtra. ibid. l 4. c 3. fol. 303.

theirs alſo, for by euens & ods, they make their praiers long or ſhort. To incite you to this holy conflict I wil cal to your remembrances, the paines of very worthy men both aliue and dead. Let it bee the honor of Biſhop *Iuell* once biſhop of *Sarum*, that his reply, & Apology ſtand ſafe without iuſt reprehenſion, when his direct adverſary *D. Harding*, reioined but to one of 27. articles. *Stapleton* returned but to 4. & thoſe ſo meanly cloathed, that himſelfe might haue bin aſhamed, not anſwering the 10. part of the biſhops text leauing out whole ſheetes, to which he hath not ſaid a word; *Dorman* delt alſo againſt the Biſhop, in 4. articles too, but too too porely. Propoſe to your ſights the induſtrious toiles of *D. Fulke*, and *VVhitakers*; the one for his anſwere to the Rhemiſh teſtament, as alſo his defence of our tranſlatiõs againſt *Gregory Martin*, his anſwere to *Briſtow*, *Allen*, and others. The other for his paines againſt *Champion*, *Stapleton*, *Dureus* & *Bellarmine*. But in this, are the liuing to be preferred before the deade, in that it hath pleaſed God, to reſerue two of the ſtrõgeſt, in out liuing their firſt labours more thã 20. years, the moſt learned and iudicious Biſhop of Winton, & *D. Reynolds*, the one for his dialogues againſt the Ieſuits the other for his conference with *Hart*, wherein they ſee their deſire on their enimies, no aduerſary daring to propound againſt either of them. Who doth not thinke the memory of *D. Humfrey* is yet freſh, and laudable in the higheſt degree, for his anſwere to *Campians* chalenge; for elegancy of ſtile, exactneſſe of method, and ſubſtance of matter, without all caſt of the dice, as *Lactantius* ſaid by S^t. *Cyprian*? *D. VVillet* hath

Their Beads. Iuell. Nolo nũc aut Oxonienſes Cãtabrigienſibus, aut cantabrigienſes Oxonienſibus anteponere: vtroſque conſtat & ingenio & eruditione valuiſſe. Sic. Melc. Canus de Græcis & Latinis, l. 7. fo. 231 a, not the one before the other, but either of them before the beſt in the world. Lilly. Fulke. Whita. L. B. Wincheſt Reynoldes. Beſides, lib. de Rom. Eccleſiæ Idolol. & Apolog. Theſium. Humphrey. Erat enim ingenio facili, copioſo, ſuavi, & (quę ſermonis maxima virtus) aperto, vt diſcernere nequeas, vtrum ne ornatior in eloquendo, an

facilior in explicando, an potentior in persuadendo fuerit Lac. de Cyp. lib. de iustitia. c. 1.

bin very painefull as his Synopsis and Tetrastilon doe plainely shew. The venerable Deane of Exeter *D. Sutcliue*, may not in this page of praise be omitted, for answering aswel the most learned amõg the aduersaries, as those that haue the most dissolute tongues, *Bellarmine* and *Gifford*: It woulde be too long to reakon all, therfore I cõtent my selfe, with picking out the choise. It shal alwaies be my praiers vnto Almighty God, that whensoeuer it shall please him to call these, or any of these to him selfe out of this wearisome life, there may others arise in your places, to goe on with the cause, as the Poet speaketh of the Golden bough, *primo avulso non deficit alter*, one being taken away there wanteth not an other, and so giue the aduersarie not so much as a breathing time. And when you of the Cleargie, and Schollers haue thus discharged their duties to God the Prince; what rests for the Laity to doe, but to take vp and read, and hauing read as the men of Bærea in the Acts, to compare both sides with the scripture, & then resolue to iustifie the truth in all sinceritie? And to you I say this againe; the clearnesse and perspicuitie of your writings hath added such a plainenes to my vnderstanding, to the finding out of the truth, that if I should not absolutely averre that the doctrine this day taught and professed in this Realme were the true and sincere doctrine of Christ and of his Church, I should surely sin against mine owne conscience: the contrarie, of the Church of Rome beeing only built on the rubbish of contradictions, impieties, gloses, slights, falsifications, and forgeries, as by the samplar which I haue drawne out of their bookes, for that purpose, wil manifest.

Æneid lib 6.

Act. 17.

feſtly appeare, I ſay not to you, who are mighty in knowledge that way already, but to euerie meane reader, for whoſe ſakes only, I vndertooke this labour. The Lord Iehova continue the Kings Maieſtie in his holie intention of furthering and fauouring the doctrine eſtabliſhed, and bleſſe & proſper the Reuerend Biſhops and Cleargy, to be watchfull againſt the common adverſarie the Papiſt; And to giue the reſt of the Kingdome ſound reſolutiõ to ioine ſtrongly togither to the diſcountenauncing of Antichriſt and all his deſignes. From Tydworth the 1. of Nouember. 1607.

Ignoſcant ſcientes ne offẽdãtur neſcientes, ſatius eſt offerre habẽti quàm differre non habentẽ. Aug. de bapt. contra Donat. lib. 2. cap. 1.

Yours in all duty and reverence,

John Panke.

23 AP 57

TO AL OBSTINATE AND STIFFE Recusants held in wilfull blindnesse, and to all luke-warme indifferent Papists, not yet fully setled in their Recusancy; health of body and soundnesse of iudgment.

I Thath hitherto bin your courses (poore seduced Bretheren) by the charge that your Masters haue laid on you, to refuse all manner of conference with vs, or to read any of our treatises or books, that do any way tend to the crossing of your opinions; which purpose as it taketh away all sounde iudgement which may anie way come vnto you; so it hath given me for my part a ful & a resolute determination never to beleeue, but that by that policy they only would vphold the drift of their religion, & that they feare it woulde fal, if it shoulde come to trial. To meete with this mischiefe on your part, I haue taken a labor not vsual, to win you if it be possible to reading; I haue laide almost forty of your owne writers togither, some our owne countrymen here at home, others the best of your side that ever wrot: The Catologue of their names and editions of their books (that so you be not deceiued) I haue noted vnto you in the next pages following; I haue compared them in three of the principal questions betweene you and vs. *The sacrifice of your Masse; Reall presence, or transubstantiation, and Popes supremacy*, and do protest I never did, nor yet do thinke any man living is able to take those authors, and proue any of those points by them, or can draw out a plaine and simple forme of speech how they would bee vnderstoode in any of those questions. I am not ignorant, neither do I make your teachers so simple, but you and they can say, *you offer vp the sonne of God to his father, and that is your Masse; you haue him really present, and so you eate him, and that is your sacrament. And* This they beleeue in grosse 1 2

that the Pope is Christs Vicar, and that is your beliefe; All this I beleeue you can say, but this is not that which you ought to seeke at your teachers hands; For come to explane, what agreement your Masse hath with that which Christ did at his last supper, the night before he suffered: And what that was, which he did at his last supper, and what the morrow on the crosse; And what your Masse is to either, or both. When we aske discourse vpon this, here they stagger and turne like madde men, as though it did belong to them only to affirme what they lusted, and yeeld no account of what they say; or indeed as though they knew not what to say: Being demanded where be the words of scripture by which the Priest hath power to offer vp Christ to God his father, they answere *there be words that set forth an obligation in act and deede, but no termes expressed*, a solution to a question, much like the direction giuē by a Miller to a passenger; who bid him leaue the bottome, and ride the lower way betweene the two hils. What difference is there betweene word and tearms? Can any man distinguish? The Church offereth a daily sacrifice, not as vpon the crosse, but the selfesame thing that was offered on the crosse. The thing offered is one selfe same sacrifice; *but in the manner of doing, because it is vnbloudy*, it is in the remembrance of it. A real presence, they and you are sure of; but what Christ did at his last supper to force that real presence, none of you know. What he tooke, what he blessed, what he brake, what he gaue, whereof he spake, whē he said, *Take eate, this is my body*, that you know not, nor are ever able with al the wits you haue to explane. In the Popes supremacie, you do the like; no man amongst you whatsoeuer, is able to determine, whether he claime his *superioritie and rule iure divino* by Gods Law, yea or no; because some of you say yea, and some no; or whether he may called *vniuersall bishop*. *Stapleton* denieth it, *Bellarmine* allowet h it, which shall we beleeue? So that refusing our bookes, if you wil but read your owne, you shal content me. Reade them, sift them, compare them,

Harding. What wordes are there, and what termes, are not there? Stapleton. Not as vpon the Crosse, explane and proue.

How is it vnbloudy? The Rhemists say, that the same bloud that Christ shed on the Crosse, is in the chalice, at Masse.

Dureus saith, the sacrifice of the Masse, is not without bloud in it; but is offered without shedding of bloud. Cōt. Whit. rat. 4. fol 183. what shoulde the bloud do ther if it be not shed?

How the Pope claimeth his supremacy, is doubted of amongst them.

them, if not with ours, yet one with an other, try whither I be an Impostor or no; if you finde them constant, plaine and sincere, follow thē on Gods name, I wil neuer perswade you otherwise; but if you perceiue them inconstant, intricate and darke, so that you vnderstand not their meaning, think they may deceiue you, thinke that their words in conference are more cunningly placed, then their arguments are in disputation, when they are driven to proue; in the one they saie to you, what they please; and in the other they must proue what they can. I do freely protest vnto you, I impute not this to the disability of the men; if they had a right cause in hand, they could easily make it good, but as *Lactantius* saide of *Tully*, *Hæc non est Ciceronis culpa, sed sectæ*, This is not *Ciceroes* fault, but the sects whereof he was; so, that your Masters can bring their matters to no better passe in discourse, is not their fault, but the fault of the cause they haue in hand; if it could bee done they could doe it: And the same *Lactantius* noteth of the Heathen, although in the course of their liues they would never acknowledge the *only God, or the God of the Christians*; But saith he if any necessity vrged them, if any pestilence annoyed them, *tunc deum recordantur*, then they remember God *ad Deum confugiunt*, they fly to God, *à Deo petitur auxilium*, they pray helpe at Gods hand, *Deus vt subueniat oratur*, thee desire that God would succour them; so is it with our aduersaries towards vs, they beleeue vs not in the matter of the sacrament, they detest our supper, & the presence we make Christ to haue. But come to discourse, presse them hard with argument, hold thē to it, they fly their owne very words, & vse ours; ours I say wherwith we expresse our mindes, and cannot say any thing for themselues, if they borrow not our language, as by the discourse following shal be seene. Pause vpon this and demand what they meane. I cānot determine, whether I should more pittie them, or laugh at them, when I see such zealous men in their cause as they seeme to be, so deeply plūged in such miserable quavemires;

Lact. li. 2. c. 10.

Lib. 2. c. 1.

Equidem statuere nō possum dolēdum ne potius an ridendum putē cum videam & graues & doctos, & vt sibi videntur, sapientes viros, in tam miseran-dis errorum fluctibus voluitari. Lact. lib. 2 c 18.

For neuer yet did I read any of your bookes, but in on point or other, there was disagreement frō others of the same side, or the author contrarie to himselfe, or adding or subtracting from the text, which he medled with; or in some answere or defence so grosse and childish, that a weak mā might haue ouerthrowen him; Or absolutly whē the matter came to the vpshot, said noe other then that which we haue said. I wil not bee found in this impudently to belie anie of your writers, with more then is to bee found in the verie pages of their bookes, (as your men deale by vs) but what I laie vpon thē, be ye sure there to finde it. And although the whol course of this booke doe goe against you and your teachers in this kinde, yet wil I giue here a tast of their dealing beefore hand, which I purposly kept for this place, because I would not heape vp al I could saie at once, but sparse and let them fall here some & there some, the better to profit. One of the Articles wherof Bishop *Juell* contended with *D Harding* was, that the Holie Communion for the space of 600. yeares after Christ was neuer ministred opēly in the Church vnto the people vnder one kinde (which is bread, the cupp being takē from them) In discussing of which point *D Harding* graunteth, that it was ministred in *both* kinds at *Corinth* as appeareth by *S Paul*, and in sundrie other places (saith he) as wee finde most evidently in the writings of diuers ancient fathers, *Stapleton* confesseth as much, that *S Paul* and the primitiue Church vsed so to doe, longe and manie yeares. What is this but to grant the whole question, & so grow frō that which they tooke vpon them to iustifie? For if *S Paul* & the primitiue Church vsed to minister it in both kinds longe and manie yeares together; what is this but to saie as *B. Iuell* said, the communion was neuer minisired openly to the people in one kinde, for the space of 600. years after Christ? The like doth *D. Harding* confesse for the priuate Masse, for which he disputeth to iustifie the preists sole receauing, *Marie I deuie not (saith hee) but that it were more commendable*

B. Iuells chaleng art. 2. Hard. against the Bishop art. 2. fol. 55. 56.

Retorne of vntruthes art. 2. fol. 44. b.

The communion better thē the priuate Masse. Hard. art. 1. fol. 39. b

and

and more godly on the Churches part, if many well disposed & examined would be partakers of the blessed sacrament with the priest: but though the clergie be worthilie blamed for negligence herein, through which the people maie be thought to haue growen to this slacknesse and indemotion, yet notwithstanding this part of the Catholike religion remaineth sound and faultlesse. Againe, *whether I can shew, that a masse was said without companie present to receaue with the Priest that said it or no; what skilleth it? such particularities and specialties of a matter of fact, were verie seldome recorded by writers of the first 600. yeares.* If the Communion, that is a companie receiueing together, bee in that respect better then the priuate masse, (as *M. Harding* himselfe saith) where the Priest receaueth all, the people gazing on, and receaueing nothing, which is the point which *M. Iewell* blamed; and the *priuate masse* be but *a matter of small waight, and a fact*, the Priests negligence causing the peoples slacknesse; For shame leaue of to write in defence of it, as also to make that *a true Communion & spirituall receauing*, whē the People stand by & receaue nothing, as both *D. Harding* & *M. Dormā* doe. Corporally the Preist, spiritually the people, saith he; Then say I the people that receiue spiritually receiue the better; for to receiue the flesh and bloud of Christ *corporally* they assigne to the wicked and reprobate, such as Iudas, & *spiritually* they assigne only to the elect and godly. But how are both these articles of priuate masse, and halfe communion, proued against B. *Iuell* and vs, by one example; of what a silly boy did giue to a *sicke* mā at his house in a case of necessity; The boy, because the Priest was sicke, brought from him a little of the sacrament and giue it the old man? Do not these men lacke the practise of the Church for their warrant, that wil obtrude such examples? The story is to be read in *Eusebius* in Greeke, Latine, and English, and therfore there can be no mystery in it, except men desire to be abused. What saith *Eckius* touching

The priuate masse is now become a matter of small waight, & yet you saie the people receaue spiritually whē they looke on & receaue nothing Reioynder fol. 210,

This is more then a matter of smal waight as you said euen nowe, by this the preists priuate masse makes the people haue a true communion. Hard. art 1 fol. 28. Dor. art. 4 fol. 97. Hard. cont. Iuell art. 1. fol. 34 b. for a priuat masse. art. 2. fo 64. for an half communion. Saund. de visib monar l. 7. fol. 669. for the priuate masse & fol. 675. for

an halfe communion. Dureus resp. Whitak., rat. 6. fol. 3 or. Ex Euseb. eccles. hist. lib. 6. c. 44. in Greeke 35. in Latine and 43. in English Eckius enchir. loc. comm. c. 15. fol. 156.

ing praier vnto Saints departed, which doctrine is of great moment in the church of Rome, *Explicitè non est præcepta sanctorum invocatio in sacris literis?* The invocation of Saints departed is not expresſed in the holy ſcriptures; Not in the old Teſtament (ſaith he) for the Iews were prone to Idololatry; and vnder the Goſpel, it was not commanded, leaſt the Gentiles that were converted and beleeued, ſhould thinke, they ſhould bee brought againe to the worſhip of Earthly Gods. Further, (ſaith he) if the Apoſtles & Evangeliſts had taught the Saints had bin to haue bin worſhipped, it would haue argued great arrogancy in thē, as if they had ſought renowne after death; therfore the Apoſtles would not by the expreſſe ſcripture teach the calling vpon Saints. Thus far *Eckius*. The counſel of Trent doth not foūd it in the ſcriptures, but bringeth it in (by the window an other way) by cuſtome & conſent of Fathers; which they do but pretend neither, becauſe they would not let go al their hold at once. *Saunders* reakoneth this amongſt other things to be the word of God, *not his word written, but his worde vnwritten.* If we in this age of the world be to truſt to an vnwritten word, I demaund to whom that was deliuered to be kept and preſerued? In the firſt age of the world, as God gaue Laws to our Fathers without writing, ſo hee gaue them memories which ſerued in ſteede of bookes; the defects of that kinde of teaching, being knowne vnto him he relieued it by often iterating of one thing, & by putting thē in minde of one t hing often. After this grew the vſe of writing as meanes more durable to preſerue the laws of God from oblivion and corruption, as the liues of men grew the more to be ſhortned: therfore is *Moſes* ſaid to write al *the words of God*, and vnto the Evangeliſt S. *Iohn* expreſſe Charge is giuen *Scribe, write theſe things.* Againe, *Many other ſignes alſo did Ieſus in the preſence of his diſciples which are not written in this booke; but theſe things are written that yee might beleeue that Ieſus is that Chriſt that Sonne of God.* So that if now after ſo much writing, & the ceaſing of God to ſpeake to the worlde but

The inuocatiō of Saints cannot be proued neither by the old Teſtamēt, nor by the newe.

Seſſio. 25. de inuocat

De viſib. monarc. l. 1. fol. 12

Hoker Eccleſ. pol. l. 1. par. 13.

The benefit of hauing diuines lawes written

Exod. 24. 4.

Apoc. 1. 11. & 14. 13.

Ioh. 20. 30. 31.

but by writing, we ſhal divert from his written worde, to his vnwritten, it wilbe to turne the truth of God into a lie, and to follow fables in ſteed of truth. If this part of the doctrine of the Church of Rome *in praying to Saints* be without al warrãt of holy ſcripture as *Eckius* and *Saunders* do allow; how much to blame are they, who would drawe a preſcript & rule from Christs owne words on the croſſe, when he cried *Eli, Eli, My God my God*, why haſt thou forſaken me; ſaying that it was familiar to the faithful Iews to *pray vnto Saints*: becauſe they thought that Christ had called on *Elias*? Is it not a miſerable gloſſe, that eateth out the bowels of the text? If it were an vſual thing with the Iews to pray vnto Saints: how ſaid *Eckius* that the Iewes had it not in vſe, becauſe they were prone to idololatry, and to whom ſhould they pray? The fathers of the old teſtament, (ſaith he alſo) were in *Limbo*, in hel; The Iews that ſaid Christ called on *Elias*, did deride & mocke him: & ſo do the Papiſts abuſe vs, that alleadge the holy ſcriptures to ſuch purpoſes; But into how many ſhapes, wil they turne this one parcel of ſcripture and make it ſerue more waies thã one? *Saunders* alleadgeth it for the ſervice in an vnknowne tongue, becauſe the Iews ſeemed to miſtake Christ. How neere that ſpeech of Christ on the croſſe commeth either in favour of *praying to Saints: or to the ſervice in an vnknown tongue*, I wil not ſticke even now to make themſelues iudges. The Doctrine of pardons hath brought no ſmal treaſure to the church of Rome, & yet *Alphonſus*, reverẽceth it but for new; Againſt the error of denying pardons ſaith he, I wil contend in few words, becauſe amongſt al the things whereof we diſpute in this work, there is none that the holy ſcriptures haue leſſe mentioned *then pardons*, and wherof the ancient writers *haue leſſe ſpoken*. This report of *Alphonſus* doth *Polidore Virgill* confirme out of *Fiſher*, who was biſhop of Rocheſter, in theſe words: No Divine doth at al doubt (ſaith he) whether there be purgatory, but yet among the ancient fathers, there is no mention at al of it, or very ſeldome, yea euen the Greekes to

Dureus Conf. Whi rat. 1. f. 44 Cope dial. 3. fol. 332. to the ſame purpoſe.

Matth. 27. 47.

De viſib mon. l. 7. fo. 679. for the ſeruice in an vnknowne tongue

Alphonſ. a caſtro. l. 8. verb. indulg.

Pardõs haue no ground either in antiquity or in the ſcriptures.

Polid. Virg. de invent. rerum li. 8. c. 1. f. 614.

this

this day beleeue it not, for so long as there was no care for purgatory *nemo quæsivit indulgentias, no man sought after pardõs*, for vpon that dependeth all the credit of *Pardons*. So may they both be left, as having no ground in the word of God. Here you haue an open and knowen confession of themselues, that for these maine points of their religion, *Priuate messe; halfe communion, praiers to Saints, Purgatorie, and pardons*, that the holy scripture doth not speake in fauour of them, no nor antiquitie neither. Touching the Popes office, they are not yet resolued what to think of it; First *Stapleton* telleth vs *That the Pope succeedeth not S Peter in the Apostleship*, of the Apostleship there is noe succession: by an absolute deniall. *Bellarmine* saith *succedit aliquo modo in Apostolatu*, the Pope succeedeth after a sort in the Apostleship, that is, in the care of the whole world. After a sort saith he. The Rhemistes cõclude the affirmative, without any qualification, *That the Roome and dignitie of the Pope is a verie continuall Apostleship*, by an absolute concession. So what they cãnot perfect at once they wil by degrees. It is not saith *Stapleton*, it is after a sort saith *Bellarmine*, nay it is indeed saie the *Rhemists*. They stagger in more then this about his holines, euen of what force & strength his determinatiõ is. *Sedes Apostolica*, The Apostolike sea, beecause it representeth the whole Church as the head, holdeth the first place after generall counsells, in defining matters of faith, saith *Alphonsus*; And I take not (saith hee) the Apostolike sea for the Pope alone, seeing hee maie erre in the faith, as did *Liberius* & *Anastasius*, but by the sea Apostolike I vnderstand the whole Colledge of Cardinals and other learned and approued men, if they maie bee had to aid and assist the sentence which is to be giuen. *Bellarmine* shutteth out counsell, and Cardinalls, and all, & maketh the sentence of generall counsells of noe force, except there bee added to it, the allowance of the Pope as the last vpshot; Nay hee will not only make him aboue al counsels, and the whole Church, but he wil make him the whole Church too;

No purgatory no pardons.

Princip doctr. 6. c. 7. & 17.

Noe succession in the Apostleship.

De Rom. Pont l. 2. c. 31. fo 324

After a sort.

Rhem. Annot. Ephes. 4. v. 11.

That a verie continuall apostleshipp.

Alphons. à castro. l. 1 fol. 176

The sea Apostolike cõmeth after generall counsells.

De Rom. pont l. 4 c. 1. fol. 470

De concil. author. l. 2. c. 19. fol. 183.

for

for where wee obiect by a cleare euidence drawen from a text of holie scripture, that the Church is the last tribunall, wherat al men must stand on earth, bececause Christ said to *Peter Tell the Church*, the occasion maie allight on the Pope aswel as on anie other, to referre synners to the Church, and therfore the Pope ought to acknowledge the Church to be greater then himselfe, hee answereth that the Pope maie in some sort performe that order of reproofe; First, saith he the Pope ought to admonish him that offendeth priuatlie; next if that serue not, to cal witnesses, lastly, to tel it to the church that is, *to tell it to himselfe*, as to the president and Church ouer whom hee is, that is to saie, to excommunicate him publiklie. Did euer anie man heare such bale shifts? *Bellarmine* flieth the Church and retireth to the Pope, *Saunders* on the other side beeing hard driuen for *Honorius* the Pope, whoe being condemned for an hereticke, was so taken and reputed, refuseth him & flieth to the Church, for although (saith hee) *Honorius* had fallen into heresie, yet can it not bee said *the Church of Rome did erre* in the faith, who did not onlie not decree anie such thinge, but also did alwaies detest that *heresie*, wherof *Honorius* was condemned; The like and more he saieth in defence of *Anastasius* the 2 whome Gratian in the decrees doth note for an hereticke, For hauing said that although *Anastasius* had consorted & communicated with hereticks, *tamen ab omni heresis crimine libera manssisset Romana Ecclesia*, yet had the Romã church remained safe without all fault of heresie, addeth, That although the Church of Rome did, or shoulde haue for some smale time fallen into heresie, yet had God (and so he did) shew his wonderful prouidence towards that sea, in respect that the Pope, who caused the error, was therfore stricken frõ aboue, least by the *sea of Peter the Catholike church* should be drawen into error, noe man following the Pope therin, becaule he was smittẽ of God; nor must we, saith he, respect *what Bishops doe*, but what they lawfullie doe, seeing Christ

Mat. 18. 15. 1. reproue him 2. take 1. or 2. 3 tel the Church

Tell it to the Church that is, to himselfe The Pope is he Church. De visib. mon. l. 7. fol 394.

Though Honorius fel into heresy yet the Church of Rome did not Saunders ibid fol. 362. 364.

The Church of Rome may for some smal time fale into heresie

commanded his people to followe and obay those thinges which they who sit in the *Chaire* of *Moses* should command: And that is vnderstood to be lawfully don which is don (after the ancient custome) according to the mind of a counsel. Seeing therfore the Church of Rome decreed noe such thinge vnder *Anastasius*, verilie it is free everie waie from heresie. If the Church of Rome, can now saue the Popes credit, that free and he faulty; how is his determination, the vpshot of al, and aboue al? How is he the church it selfe? And how is nothing firme, without his ratification, as *Bellarmine* striveth to proue? And which is most material, how doth *hee strengthen his bretheren*, if he may be an heretike & they free? So that in these conclusions, *Bellarmine* neither standeth with *Alphonsus*, nor with *Saunders*, as hath bin shewed, no nor with himselfe; For *Alphonsus* subiected the sea of Rome, the church of Rome, consisting of the Pope, Cleargy, and other godly men there, vnto a general coũsel; *Bellarmine* preferreth the Popes voice or decree aboue all, yea maketh him the church; yet other where, he setteth for the Church, not the Pope alone, but the Pope and the people; and that whẽ the ancient fathers and the Popes do say the Church of Rome cannot erre, that then they are to be vnderstood that in the Church of Rome, there shal alwaies be a *Catholicke bishop* teaching, & *Catholicke* people hearing or iudging, in concluding both vnder the name of the Church of Rome; and so hath he slaine himselfe with his owne sword.

By this reason it will followe that the Pope sitteth not in the Chaire of Moses

The Church of Rome can now saue the Popes credit.

Bellar. nether standeth with Alphonsus nor Saunders, nor with himselfe.

The sea of Rome subiect to a generall coũsel.

Bell. de Rom. pontif. l. 4. c. 4. fol. 486

Furthermore *Bellarmine* is so carefull for the Pope, that though he hold opinion touching a matter of faith; as other men do; if in examination, it happen to be an error, yet shal it be none in the Pope, but must be one in al men else: For trial of this let any man read the 1. & 2. chapt. *de sanct. beat.* where he proueth it an error vpon whom soeuer shall thinke that the *soules of the blessed doe not see God vntill the last day*. This error is put vpon *Iohn* 22. *Bellarmine* confesseth as much, *Ioannem hunc reverâ sensisse animas non visuras Deum, nisi post resurrec-*

Bellarmines goodwil to the Pope.

Bellar. de Sanctor. beatit. l. 1 c. 1. & 2

rell. de Rom. pont. l.4.c.14. fol.549.&c.12 fol.531. he saueth Pope Nicholas by the like.

rectionem. That *Iohn* 22. did verily beleeue, that the soules see not God vntil the last day; But this he thought (saith he) when he might so thinke without danger of heresie, *nulla enim adhuc processerat Ecclesiæ definitio*, for there had no determinatiō of the church gone before. Why? The determinatiō of himselfe, is the determination of the church, aswel as you said before, *his telling of a thing to himselfe, was the telling of it to the church.* And why excuseth he the Pope, by the not determination of the Church? When hee telleth vs himselfe, *That neither generall counsels* nor *particular*, (*which otherwise are subiect to erre*) *can erre, of the Pope confirme them.* And yet see the man, he telleth vs, that *Iohn* need not to reuoke the error *cum in errorem nullum incidisset*, for he fel into no error. If hee fel into no error neither did they fal into any error, on whō *Bellarmine* laieth the same error, nor must hee cal it an error to say, *The soules of the righteous see not God vntil the last day*, seeing he himselfe saith that *Iohn* so held and yet held no error. Frō absurd and grosse cōclusions, they fal to flat *blasphemies. The reward of sin is death, but everlasting life is the gift of God*, saith S. *Paul*; the Rhemists say, in their annotations, that *The sequele of the speech required, that as he said death or damnation is the stipend of sin; so life everlasting is the stipend of iustice, & so it is.* What indignity is this to the holy Ghost to crosse him so manifestly? S. *Paule* maketh opposition betweene eternal life & eternal death, touching the cause of either. The proper working cause of death is sin, so saith the Apostle, *The reward, wages, or stipend of sin is death, but everlasting life is* (what? the stipende of good workes as the Rhemists say? no: but) *the free gift of God.* Why did S. *Paule* invert and turne the sentence, if, as the one had deserued hel, so the other had deserued heaven, but only to exclude what the Rhemists bring in? They iterate this in an other place, where they say *Heaven is as well the reward of good works: as hell is the stipend of ill workes.* This is also seconded by one from Rhemes, who saith that the Apostle Saint *Paule* laieth in indifferent ballance good works and euil, & mak-

De conc. auth l.2.c.2.& 5.

De Rom. pont l.4.c.14.f.551

Rom.6.23. Rhem annot. on that Text. Blasphemies & Contradictiōs

The Apostle might as easilie haue said so, as they if it had bin so. Annot.2.Cor. 5.verf.10. Wil.Reinolds cont. Whitak. fol.1051

maketh the one the cauſe of heauen, as the other is the cauſe of hel. But if it be ſo, that good works be the *cauſe, purchaſe & merit* of eternall life, (as theſe men tell vs) as trulie as euill works are the purchaſe and merit of hel, what ſaie they to their owne note, vpon another text, where they tel vs, that by the example of the two *twoo twinnes Iacob & Eſau*, it is euident that nether nations nor particular perſons bee elected eternallie or called temporallie, or preferred to Gods fauour before other, *by their owne merits*, but of the two, vvhere iuſtlie hee might haue reprobated *both*, hee ſaued *of mercie one?* What is this? as S *Paul* ſaid before *eternal life is the gift of God*, excluding *merits*. Yet they ſtand not alwaie to this laſt; For they ſaie againe, *Man hath free will to make himſelfe a veſſell of ſaluation or damnation, though ſaluation be attributed to gods mercy principally, the other to his iuſt iudgment*. How hath man free wil to make himſelfe a veſſel of ſaluation or damnation, whē ſaluation is principallie of Gods mercie, and the other of his iudgment? Whie explaine they not that darke ſpeech, that wee maie vnderſtand it? *Interpres eget interprete*, They neede more Interpreters then the text. They told vs before, that *Gods meere mercie is ſeene in the elect, and iuſtice in the reprobat*; And that they that are ſaued, muſt hold *of gods eternal purpoſe, mercy and election*; And *this election and mercy dependeth on his owne purpoſe, will, & determination*; & *that all are worthie of damnation, before they bee firſt called to mercie*. Make good this doctrine which they haue laſt ſet downe, and agreed vpon, & the former will proue blaſphemous, and deregatorie to the maieſtie of God, *That good workes are the cauſe of heauen, as euill are the cauſe of hell. Or that man hath free will to make himſelf a veſſell of ſaluation or damnation*. I doubt not if the Rhemiſts be followed, but that a man might take vp moe contradictions then thoſe before, which they haue heaped amongſt their notes in that teſtament. Where S. *Paul* writing to *Tymothy* willeth him to inſtruct with meekneſſe, thoſe that reſiſt or vvithſtand the truth, prouing if at anie time *God will*

Rhem. Annot. Rom c. 9 v. 11. & 16.

Rhem. Annot 2. Tim. 2. v. 21.

Annot. Rhem. Rom 9. v. 6. 11 14. & 16.

2. Tim 2. 25. God giueth repentance.

gine them repentance, that they maie acknowledge the truth; they note; *That conversion from sin and heresie, is the gift of god, and of his speciall grace*. I might aske them first, how this agreeth with their owne note one the other side of their owne leafe, (so oft mentioned before; *Man hath free wil to make him selfe a vessel of salvation or damnation.*

Annot. vppon that place in the margent. pag. 589.

But I wil leaue that now, and demand of them howe it agreeth with this; *The grace of god worketh not in man against his will, nor forceth anie thing without his acceptation and consent, and therfore it lieth in a mans will to frustrate or to followe the motion of god.* And this, *The father draweth vs, and teacheth vs to come to his sonne and beleiue these high and hard mysteries, not compelling or violently forcing any against their will or without any respect of their consent, but by the sweet internall motions and perswasions of his grace and Spirit* hee vvholie maketh vs *of our owne will and liking to consent to the same.* And in another place most plainlie *The vehement perswasion that god vseth both externally by force of his word & miracles, and internally by his grace, to bringe vs vnto him* is called compelling, not that he forceth any to come to him against their wils, but that hee can alter and mollifie an hard hart, & make him willing that before would not. How these notes agree, al men maie see. If conuersion from sin & heresie, bee the gifts of God, and of his speciall grace, and that hee wholie maketh vs of our owne will and liking to consent, and that hee doth alter and mollifie an hard harte and maketh him willing that before woulde not. I woulde knowe vvhat freewil man hath to vvish his own conuersion (vvhich is a supernaturall thing) before Gods grace and illumination come. Can it concurre vvith a thing which is not? A wil to wish our conversiō is not there before grace come, nether lieth it in man to frustrate the grace of God, vvhen hee doth effectuallie call vs, as appeareth by S *Paul* called in the Acts: Againe if it lie in mans power to frustrate or follow the motion of God, how is conuersion from sinne and heresie the gift of God, which they saie also? So that as the two

Annot. 2. cor. 6 v. 1.
Annot. Ioh. 6. v. 44.
Annot Luc. 14. v. 23.
Conuersion from sin. & heresie is the gift of God
For whosoeuer are lead by the spirit of God Rhem. Rom. 8. v. 14. in marg. Hee meaneth not that the children of god be violently compelled against their wills, but that they bee sweetly drawn moued, or induced to doe good. ex Aug. Ench. c. 64. de verbis domin. Serm. 43. c. 7 & de verb. Apost ser. 13. c. 11. 12 Acts. 9.

first notes, do oppugne each other, so doe the two last also, ioining fairely with the doctrine of the Church of England in one maine point of controversie, which is *Free will*. To say that God altereth and mollifieth an hard hart *& maketh him willing, that before would not*, is to say, *That God maketh vs then willing being otherwise by nature vnwilling, and so he regenerateth vs, not against our wils, but with our wils; yet so as the willingnesse to be regenerate is not of vs, but of God*. If they will stand to their own notes, they may subscribe to this of ours. *Bellarmine* will come to vs himselfe, rather then we shall be alone in this question of *our conversion and free will: Conuersio hominis ad deum, vt etiam quodlibet aliud opus pium, quatenus opus, à libero arbitrio est tantũ, non tamen seclusa auxilio generali, quatenus pium à SOLA GRATIA est, quatenus opus pium, à libero arbitrio est & gratiâ.* The conversion of man vnto God (saith he) as every other godly worke, so farre forth as it is a worke, is only of free wil, not excluding Gods general helpe; so farre forth as it is *Godlie*, it is *ONLIE* of *Grace*, and so farre forth as it is a *Godlie vvorke*, it is of Free will and Grace together. For the efficient cause of everie action of man, as it is an action, is from the will of man; as it is free, it is by the freedome of the vvill, as it is Godlie, it is by the good seede and sufficient helpe for that seed. Further, Grace only doth make that the action or deed of man be godly and supernatural; which nature with al his strength can never reach vnto. What is this, but our assertion, and the overthrow of himselfe and his fellows in this question? We never denied a natural power in man, simply to wil this or that, but to wil that is good, we hold it a worke of grace only, as *Bellarmine* here confesseth. *Liberè agere est humanæ naturæ, & ita cum ratione coniunctum vt ab ea non separetur, liberè agendo malum eligere, est corruptæ naturæ, bonum verò eligere est gratiæ*, saith a great protestant out of S. *Augustine*, Freely to do a thing, is of the natural power in man, and so ioined to his reason, that it cannot be separated from it, in this free choice to chuse a thing that is

Perkins Treatise of mans freewill and Gods free grace fol. 102.

De gratia & lib. arbit. l. 6. c. 15. fol. 557.

The good that is in the worke is of grace.

Petrus Baro super Ionam. Thes. 1. fo. 326 ex Aug.

is naught, is the corruptneſſe of nature, *but to chuſe the good is of grace. Bellarmine* in one place complaineth that *Pighius*, otherwiſe a great Catholike, went away frō that ſide in ſome queſtiōs, becauſe he addicted himſelfe to read *Calvins* works; and I doubt me when *Bellarmine* ſhal be called hence, they wil ſay of him, he was too nere a proteſtant. For beſides that before; in the great queſtion of *Merite*, thus he writeth, *Propter incertitudinē propriæ iuſtitiæ & periculum inanis gloriæ, tutiſſimum eſt fiduciam totam in ſola dei miſericordia & benignitate reponere.* In reſpect (ſaith he) of the incertainty of our own righteouſneſſe and for feare of vaine glory, *It is the ſafeſt way*, to place al our truſt and hope, in the alone goodnes and mercy of God. He ſeeth wel the weaknes of his cauſe, for which he ſtriveth; otherwiſe he would never haue come to the truth ſo freely, howſoeuer in the expounding of his meaning in thoſe words (which are plaine enough and need no expoſition) he would faine marre them againe; For he would yet haue vs beleeue that *our workes* are *vera iuſtitia*, very righteouſneſſe, and that they can abide *the iudgement of God*; *and may be relyed vpon*; which, if it were ſo, where is the defect, which cauſeth thē to fly to his alone mercy? God is not vniuſt, if their works wil abide his trial, let them claime their due of deſert without *mercy or fauor*. For to him that worketh is the reward not reakoned of *grace* but of *duty*, ſaith S. *Paule*. Again, diſcourſing againſt his ancient brother *Durand* touching that text of S. *Paule*, *which the iuſt iudge ſhal giue vnto me at that day*, he ſaith, that to ſpeake *abſolutely* man cānot exact or require any thing of God, ſince *all that we haue is his gift*, yet taking in (as it were) the wil of God and his promiſe, in that he wil not exact our works of vs for nothing, but vvil render a reward according to the proportion of the workes, we may exact a reward of him; and therefore (ſaith he) the works of the righteous, *remoto pacto vel promiſſione*, ſetting his covenant and promiſe aſide, are not worthy of eternal life. Gods mercy and promiſe is then his beſt ſtake, howſoeuer ſome-

De grat. & lib. arb. l. 1. c. 3. f. 50

See the ſame in Rey. admonit. ad lect. 10. in li. de Rom. Eccle. Idolol. f. 3

In very manie things Bellarmine is a proteſtant, or at the leaſt not a Papiſt, Doctor Doue in his book of recuſancy.

De iuſtific. l. 5. cap. 7. fol 424.

It is the ſafeſt way to truſt to the alone mercy of God

Rom. 4. 4.

De iuſtific. l. 5. c. 16. fol. 463.

2. Tim. 4. 8.

Ibid. fol. 465.

sometimes he would pul it vp. To make our workes truely and properly meritorious, and fully worthy of euerlasting life, and more principal causes in the matter of iustification then faith, to make them the cause of heauen, as ill deeds, are the cause of hel; To say that we may trust vnto them, that they are *true righteousnesse*, and that they are able to abide the iudgment of God: And yet to say, that it is of his free mercie and liberality, that either he promised any such reward to our works, and that the works of themselues are his & none of ours, and that when he crowneth our works, he crowneth his owne gifts, & that he rewardeth them aboue our desert, and al this in respect of his free promise and graunt; are the words of men that are disposed to play their parts on a stage, and when they are out of their parts to imagin some God to come downe amongst them to keepe their credit with the people; for their tenor and breefe of all their talke is, *we haue truely and properlie deserued heauen, because of his free bountie & mercie he first promised and then gaue it vs.* Stapleton after much debating of this question, commeth in the end to this. That whensoeuer we doe read in the ancient fathers that *god is debter vnto vs, in the great gift of eternal life*, it must be vnderstood as debter to himselfe, and in respect of his owne promises, and that hee is not debter vnto vs, to himselfe, not to vs, for his own promises, not for the worthines of vs or our woorks: If this suffice them wee will stand to it, God is iust (saie we) in that he keepeth promise and doth not deceaue his of that reward, which they hope for, but the promise is free, for freely he promised, and freely hee giueth, yet in that hee bound himself vnto vs by his free promise, it was iust that he should performe the same *not that wee haue iustly and worthilie deserued any part of that reward*, but because it is meete that God be alwaies faithfull in his words: And so make him, if debter to any, thē to himselfe, as Stapleton speaketh: The Crowne is the reward which God hath promised to the worke, not because the worke is worthie of it, but because it pleased him so gra-

ciously

What they say of good works Rhem. 2. Tim. 4. v. 8. Iean. c. 3 v. 22.

what they say of good works

De vniuers. iust. doct. lib. 10 c. 7. fol. 361.

God is debter to himself not not to vs.

Whitak. cont. Gul. Reynold. fol. 58.

tiously and liberaly to bestowe such excellent rewards vpō vs, that haue deserued so little; and so keep in with the promise and couenant, and exact nothing of him because al are his, as *Bellarmine* avoucheth. And when he crowneth vs he crowneth his owne gifts, not our workes, giuing before what he repaieth after. For how should hee repay as a iust iudge, vnlesse he had first giuen as a merciful father? & how should this be a crowne of iustice, if *grace* had not gon before, which iustifieth the vngodly man as saie the Rhemists?

Cui redderet coronam iustitiæ, si nō donasset gratiā misericors pater? & quo modo esset ista corona iustitiæ, nisi præcessisset gratia quæ iustificat impium? Aug. de gra & lib. arb. c. 6. Annot. 2. Tim. 4. v. 8.

Of these notes, and the rest in this whole booke following I would haue you that are seduced to demand of your teachers what they thinke, praying them to reveiwe & reexamine them: and for your parts to marke how they answere & defend their opiniōs, but see with your own eies trust not theirs Thinke that the verie debating of these questions (vvhich they cannot chuse but handle) hath drawen such confessiōs from them; settle your selues but once to compare their reasons, First with the holie scripture, then with the ancient fathers of the primitiue time, and lastly by the protestant writers of this age in the Church of England, and then iudge where the truth is, you wil then sone perceiue (I wil speake of one for all) that noe man can more fully contradict *Bellarmine*, then *Bellarmine* doth himselfe, as *Lactantius* said of *Tully*. If he or anie of them, or al of them bee growen in your opinions great, it is but the elemēts of your sloth that wil not giue you leaue to looke on him. *Calamitas huius temporis laudem viri propagauit.* The miserie of this time wherin pusillanimity so much reigneth in your mindes, hath gotten him the praise he hath, and not the cause he handleth; for looke into that, and you vvill bee ashamed both of it and him. Wee all iumpe in this. As noe building standeth without a sure and substantial foundation; so noe life, no saluation is to be hoped for vvithout a right and true faith.

Nec enim posterit; ab vllo Cicero quam Cicerone vehementius refutari. l. 2. c. 9. fol. 148 Cicer pro domo sua post medium. Staplet. in the fortresse. f. 5. b

Let vs therfore look whom vve trust and what vve beleue *Si religio tollitur, nulla nobis ratio cum cœlo est.* Take away religi

Lactant. l. 3. c 10. fol. 224.

on, and we haue noe societie with heauen: the labour therof is not vnprofitable leading vs to destruction, but profitable bringing to salvation. Beleiue not them that woulde drawe you from knowledge. Knowe that they abuse you, that saie the scriptures are not for you to read, and al to keepe you in ignorance, because you shal not see what they say or doe. Take you heed of them that teach you worshiping of Images; praying to Saints; that plead their pardons & their purgatorie, noe one sillable in Gods booke sounding anie waie to eithet of them. I knowe they haue excuses, that you doe it not to the image, but to the thinge represented; which excuse besides that it is the same that the Iewes, and all Idolaters that vvere heathen could make for themselues, it is a mõstrous vntruth in it selfe. They know there be amongst them who haue written in defence of the vvorshiping of the imag of the Crosse and trinitie, even vvith the same vvorship that the trinitie should be worshiped vvith. The learned amongst them knowe, that this vvhich I saie is true. Leaue I beseech you your old and vvorneout excuses, which hetherto some of you haue bin accustomed to make in defence of the religion, you are in liking with, which are *so didwee learne, so did, our ancients teach, they were wise enough, they knewe what they did and what was best*, and so spoile your selues of iudgment, and banish reason only to rest on other mens errors.

But if you wil needs go to Fathers & ancients, go to thẽ of 1500. 1400. 1300. 1200. 1000. yeares since, & not to thẽ which lived in the *Tyranny of ignorance*, for 400. 300. or 200. yeares ago, whẽ Sathan had covered the greatest Monarkies in darknes, and ignorance, some few sparkles here and there arising, being with the fogge & mist that then spread it selfe, soone put out. Policy is the best point that their religiõ ever thriued by. That this is true, I wil lay a briefe of the method which your masters vse, (and you know is true) in propagating their religion. First they take away al vse of reading the holy scriptures from the Laity whom they teach & instruct.

Next

Non hic nobis labor Inutilis ad pernitiem, sed vtilis ad salutem. Aug ep. 111.

The Iewes could tel that the golden calfe which they worshipad was not God; yet were they idolaters and the heathen did not thinke that those thinges which they made with their hands to be Gods &c. and yet were they grosse Idolaters

A quibus si persuasionis eius rationem requiras nullam possint reddere, sed ad maiorum iudicia cõfugiant, quod illi sapientes fuerint, illi probauerint, illi scierint quid esset optimum, seque ipsos sẽsibus spoliant, ratione abdicant, dum alienis erroribus credunt. Lact. 5. c. 20.

Next they barre them from al conference or ſociety with any of whom they might learne to vnderſtand what they are taught, whether agreeable to Gods word or not. They take from them al the Proteſtants bookes, and damne them to the pit of hel, not ſuffering them to read one of them. I demand how far either a Turke or Iew, or any other miſcreant might preuaile againſt any poore ſeduced ſoule that is in their cuſtody, if they take them time enough, with theſe meanes. Thoſe they vſe touching the ignorant, for their ſchollers they haue other. Firſt they ſhall haue the ancient Fathers & Doctors, as they wil pleaſe to deliver them, by written notes of their owne gathering; if they chance to admit them to the prints, they ſhal then haue ſuch prints, as they haue newly ſet for the purpoſe; the ancient copies being altered. Then they haue a deviſe to ſhew them counterfait writings of the Fathers and Doctors, ſuch as they never wrote, in ſteed of true; and therefore learned and vnlearned, ſcholler or not ſcholler had need take heed to them in that. And whē they are hardly purſued, out comes the *Index expurgatorius*, in māner of a note booke, to tell the younger ſort, when & wherein they ſhall refuſe any author that maketh againſt the doctrine of the church of Rome: And adde vnto this practiſe ſuch an opinion as this, *The Church of Rome cannot erre whatſoever it decree: and the Pope of Rome is not to be accuſed whatſoever he doth.* And thus they ſeduce both one ſort and other. If ever there were ſlauery or tyranny this is it, the captivitie of the ſoule being ten thouſand times more greate & more grievous than that of the body. God hath called you vnto liberty, not to be ſervants of ſin; but to ſerue erroneous opinions is worſe than to beare tyrannous exactions. Take frō them theſe weapons, wherewith they chiefly fight, and you ſhal haue them as *Sampſon* without his haire, you may take them and chaine them where you liſt. Pardon me I deſire you, if I be large, the earneſtneſſe of my minde towards you hath cauſed it, becauſe I ſee the waies that deceiue you;

2

3

4

5

6

7 This is related more at large in the booke it ſelfe where ſpeciall mention is made of it.

8

9 Gal. 5. 1. Corinth. 7. Iudg. 15.

where the apprehenſion of the minde is great, words to ope it wil be many; *vincit officium lingua ſceleris magnitudo*. Their practiſes againſt the truth, paſſe the quickneſſe of my pen to deſcribe, and therfore every warning ſhould worke ſome warineſſe.

Touching my perſon, it ſkilleth not in this who I am, I hope you wil conſider *what is ſpoken, and not who it is that ſpeaketh, but let the ſame reaſon prevaile, whether from a young man or an old, whether from a clerke or a lay-man. There was a great man of your Church, that once ſaide, There was more heed to be given to a lay man bringing ſcripture, than to the Pope and generall counſell; And as great a man amongſt us hath ſaid, The holy Ghoſt is not tyed to any Order, degree or chaire, but bloweth where he will, neither as S. Ierome ſaith, we muſt not iudge as Pithogoras ſchollers according to what the teacher ſhall ſay, but the ſtrength of that which is taught (by whomſoever) muſt be waighed. If the truth in theſe caſes had bin to be ſought for at the hands of any ſort of mē, Popes, or Cardinals, or touching the place, Rome, Paris, or Rhemes, or any other ſeat, I am well aſſured S. Paule when he tooke his leane from thoſe of Epheſus, would not haue omitted to haue named any man or place to haue reſorted vnto, he only ſaid thus. Now brethern I commend you to God, & vnto the word of his grace, which is able to build further, and to giue you an inheritance amongſt all them that are ſanctified.*

To draw to an end. Becauſe you ſhal as plainly ſee that I can direct you where you ſhal finde the true religion taught and mainetained according to the holy ſcriptures of God, as wel as I haue noted vnto you the falſe boulſtred out, take into your hands thoſe two treatiſes of *D. Cranmers* of the Sacrament, Biſhop *Hoopers*, and Biſhop *Ridlies* of the ſame argument. Biſhop *Iuels* Reply, & defence of the Apology againſt *Harding*. *D. Nowell* againſt *Dorman*. *D. Fulkes* anſwere to the Rhemiſts teſtament. *D. Humphrey* againſt *Campian*. *D. Whitakers* againſt *Campian* and *Dureus*. *Willets Synopſis*, and *Tetraſtilon*, *D. Reinolds* conference with *Hart*, and againſt *Bellarmine* and defence of his *theſes*. *D. Sutclive* againſt *Bellarmine* otē.

My

Hoker pref. to his 5. booke of Eccleſ polic. Quæſo à vobis vt eadem oratio æqua, æque valeat. Panormitanus Laur. Humfr. cont. Camp. ratio p. 2. fol. 381. & 456. Spiritus ſanctus non alligatur ordini vel gradui vel cathredæ &c. Quare nec ex munere homi num, nec ex perſonarum celſitate, ſed ex cauſæ veritate omnia ſunt æſtimāda Act. 20

The cheiſe that haue writ ten in the controuerſies, a litle before Queene Elizaigne, & ever ſince.

My Lord of Winchesters Dialogues against the Iesuits. *D. Abbot* against *Hil*, or any other treatises of these against your side, you shal see the truth of Gods holy worde in seuerall parts discussed in so wonderfull an harmony, that though some of them liue now, and some be gone, they speak al one language, they all pronounce *Shibboleth* plainly, it being but one truth which they speake. In their volumes and writings be many and infinite quotations, both of scriptures, fathers, Doctors, Councels, histories, laws, decrees, both Greeke and Latine: pervse them, view them, single them out in the questions they treat of (& they treat of al betweene the church of Rome, and the church of England) in the Masse, sacrifice, real presence, service in a strange tongue, halfe communion, Popes supremacy, worshipping of Images, or in any difference else, and shew me any apparant abuse of holy scripture or history, contradiction each from other, shift, couler or deuise, to darken the truth in any of those points, let it be in the least nature, as those that I haue already, & will further shew in the booke following, and I protest before God I wil fully giue over either to write or speak any thing against you, but wil wholy apprehend your religion, as consonant to the truth. They that sow winde shall reape a storme. Brethren be not children in vnderstanding, but as concerning maliciousnes be children, but in vnderstanding be men of a ripe age. I beseech almightie God to make vs as wise as Serpents in prouiding the food of everlasting life to nourish our soules, and as innocent as doues in doing ill, that the corruptions of our liues doe not taint it.

From Tidworth, the 1. of Nouember.

1607.

John Panke.

Iud. 12. 6.

Osey. c. 8.

1. Cor. 14. 20.

Da domine, vt te quem bene credendo confiteor male viuendo nō denegem, & te quem strenuè fide sequor, ac tu negligentiæ operibus non offendam. Aug. Epist. 111.

THE NAMES OF THE POPISH Writers, out of which this booke hath beene gathered.

1 *The third part of Thomas Aquinas ſummes, with Caietans tracts annexed. printed at Lions.* 1588.
2 *The Sentences of Lumbard. at Lions.* 1593.
3 *The Trent counſell. at Antwerpe.* 1596.
4 *The Romane Catechiſme, ſet out by the decree of the Tridentine counſell.* 1596. *at Antwerpe.*
5 *The Index Expurgatorius, by the decree of the Tridē-tine counſell. at Lions* 1586.
6 *The Engliſh Teſtament, ſet out by the Colledge at Rhemes. anno* 1582.
7 *Copes Dialogues, at Antwerpe.* 1566.
8 *Gregorie Martin, againſt our authoriſed tranſlatiōs at Rhemes.* 1582.
9 *D. Allen of the ſacraments. at* Antwerpe. 1576.
10 *Stapleton of Iuſtification againſt the proteſtants. at* Paris 1582.
11 *Saunders viſible monarchy at Wirceburge.* 1592.
12 *Albertus* Pyghius, *of eccleſiaſticall gouernment for the Popes Monarchie. at Colen.* 1572.
13 *Alphonſus à Caſtro againſt hereſies.* 1534.
14 *Tonſtall b. of Duriſme, of the truth of the body and bloud of Chriſt in the Euchariſt. at* Paris. 1554.
15 *Melchior Canus, his diuinitie places. at Colen.* 1585.
16 *Hieronymus Torrenſis. gathered S. Aug. Confeſſions. at Paris,* 1580.
17 *Andradius defence of the Tridentine counſell. at Colen.* 1580.

18 Another of Andradius in defence of the diuines of Colen against Kemnitius. at Colen. 1564.
19 Lodovicus Granatensis of a publike Communion at Colen. 1586.
20 Eckius Enchiridion of common places at Colen. 1600.
21 Genebrards Chronicles. at Colen. 1581.
22 Fasciculus Temporum.
23 Polidorus virgilius, of the first finders out of thinges at Franckford. 1599.
24 Abdias, Bishop of Babylon writing the liues of the Apostles, at Colen. 1576.
25 The third tome of the Homeles of the auciēt fathers, set out by the decree of the Trēt coūsel, at Lions 1588
26 D. Hardings answere to B. Iuell chalenge. at Antwerpe 1565.
27 D. Hardings Reioynder to B. Iewells Replie.
28 Dormans proofe of certaine articles denied by M^r. Iewell, at Antwerpe, 1564.
29 The returne of vntruthes by Stapleton against B. Iuells reply. at Antwerpe. 1566,
30 A Catechisme by Laurence Vaux Bachelour of diuinitie. an. 1583.
31 VVilliam Reynolds, against D. VVhitaker, called a refutation of sundry reprehensions, written at Rhemes, and printed at Paris. 1583.
32 Stephen Gardiner against B. Cranmer touching the sacrament, called an explication and assertion of the true Catholike faith &c.
33 Another of his called a detection of the deuils sophistrie anno. 1546.

34 The fortresse of the faith by Stapleton, annexed to Bedes history in english.

35 Iohn Dureus, his confutation of D. Whitakers answere in the behalfe of Campian. Paris. 1582.

36 The disputations of Bellarmine against the Protestants in generall, in 9. volumes reveiwed and acknowledged by the author. at Ingolstadium by Adame Sartorius. anno 1599.

37 Meditations, on the mysteries of the Rosary, of the most blessed Virgin Marie. translated into english.

38 A popish supplication to the Kings Maiestie. 1604.

39 Guicciardines historie in english by G. Fenton.

40 A table in writing hand, of a Catalogue of the Popes from Saint Peter hitherto,

41 The firme foundation of Catholike religion, translated by Panffoote, & approued by Stapleton. Antwerpe 1590.

42 Platina, with Onuphrius annotations, on the liues of the Popes. at Louaine anno. 1572.

43 Anastasius, the Popes librarie keeper, of the liues of the Popes. at Maguncе. anno. 1602.

The Speakers { *Tuberius the Gent.*
Romannus the Scholler

YOV knowe *Romannus*, if so you remember, that through a meere accident, or rather a determination of God about Easter was 12. moneths, you and I did meet; when after some words of controuersie, wee fell into a discourse touching my beeing abroad at that festiual time, which occasioned some further matter touching a scruple in my mind then vttered vnto you, *my not receauing of the Communion, neither then, nor at anie time before.*

Rom. Indeed *Tuberius*, I remember it wel, as also the summe of our talke at that time deliuered; I hope I satisfied you in that point, *how necessarie to salvation it is for euerie Christian man to participate of the flesh and bloud of Christ in the sacrament of the supper*, so that for that matter, I hope you need no farther lessons.

Tub. For the necessitie therof I am resolued; but yet by the settling therof, there is an other question annexed to it, which I am afraid wilbee noe lesse a maine barre vnto my conscience, for not receauing now, as that other was before of doubt, whether I might receaue at all or not: the former of the thinge, this other of the beleife of the thinge. For not to hide from you anie thinge, which maie breed my disquiet, but to acquaint you therwith, since my last being with you, I did light into other companie, where talking of questions of saluatiō, I related vnto them so much of our conference, as touched the maine point of necessitie of receauing that sacrament, and was told by them, that I did verie wel in apprehending so hie a point in the worship & seruice of God; But when I related, what manner of man you were, in laying o-

pen vnto me, *what a ſacrament was, of the dignitie and worth of that ſacrament, and loſſe that I had, the while that I abſtained*, and other inſtructions therto belonging, as at the latter end you did, they perceiued what you were, and were noe leſſe angry vvith me for attending you therin, then offended with you for inſtructing mee that waie. They called themſelues *Catholikes*, of others they are vſually ſtiled *Papiſts*, but whatſoeuer they be in name, me thinkes their care ouer me is very good, that I ſhould enter the right waie touching my beeleiſe in that ſacrament.

Rom. Why? what perceaued they by my wordes of that ſacrament?

Tub. They take you to hold not Catholiklie of it, neither as our Lord and ſauiour Ieſus Chriſt did firſt inſtiture it, nor as the ancient times of 1500. yeares, by Fathers, counſels, and Doctors did; and therfore they wiſhed mee to make a ſtand, and pauſe, before I ioined with you therin; For you teach, that they who receaue it at your hands receaue *only* a peece of bread, and a draught of wine, not worth anie thing and ſo call it a ſacrament of the Lords inſtitution, wheras he gaue his bodie, his reall ſubſtantiall bodie, & ſo his diſciples did eate him reallie, and ſubſtantiallie, and dranke his verie blood, and to beleiue this is healthful, holy, & religious, and they that receaue it ſo, receaue it, as Chriſt inſtituted it, and they who doe otherwiſe, receaue noe ſacrament, but *prophane bread*, as they called it; This they did ſaie of you then, touching the difference betweene them and you in that queſtion; and that in all other things, al antiquitie & conſent of al ages were for them & nothing for you.

One of Hardings ſlanders

Rhem. 1. Cor. 11. fol. 453. in fine paginæ.

Magnus nuga tor magno conatu magnas nobis nugas parit.

Rom: I doubt not, but they are verie bitterly eloquēt againſt vs, when opportunitie is offered of a fit audience, their tongues & pens are miſerablie valiant. But me thinketh *Tuberius*, you are ſuddenly growen rich in diſcourſe, who can ſo quicklie remember, that both Chriſt himſelfe, al ages, and all Doctors & counſells doe make for them againſt vs; ordinary abi-

abilitie cannot comprehend this in so short time; much like vnto a sillie gentlewoman with whom of late I talked also, who being not aboue one quarter of a yeare from her freinds returned home, with arguments as strong as yours in defence of her new obtained religion, shee could talke what a good booke the *Rhemists bible* was, she could saie the Scriptures were written in *Greeke* and *Latine*, and therfore people should praie in latine; naie she could distinguish betweene an *Idoll and an Image*, obseruing that the second commandement, was onlie directed against *Grauen Idolls*, as she tearmed them and not against *Grauen Images*. And yet nether before shee went, nor now can she read english; to such a method vvas she brought to roo quickly, to knowe what she said. I doubt not but she had bin so instructed, but not by M. *Vaux*, for he to make sure worke, hath taken that commandement wholy out of his catechisme (as remouing a block as belike standeth not in their waie, which noe wise man will euer bestowe anie labour about) recompencing his breuitie in that point, in telling the vse of certaine *Greeke* words, *Latria*, *Hyperdulia & Dulia*: where a learner is taught to worshipp anie creature in heauen or earth, and commit (as he thinketh) noe Idolatry but noe otherwise then if a grand theife should teach a puny to steale by precept, and when hee had committed the fact (that is, had stolen indeed) saie it were not the deed, and so leaue him to the gallowes. Or if it had bin her luck to haue bin schooled by him that composed *the instructiõs and aduertisements how to meditate the misteries of the Rosary*, hee would haue taught her a more compendious waie to haue defended it by, or anie other point, then by a distinction, which is, although the commandement forbid vs the *worshipping of anie Image*, yet we for our parts maie beleiue and doe otherwise. For so hee saith plainlie in an other question, though not of that waight, yet of that clearnes, where speaking al in honor of our *blessed Virgin Mary*, doth not sticke to saie, that our Lorde & redeemer did presentlie after hee was risen vp visit his

For the Rhemists testamẽt For. Hebrew & Greeke. I saie not that they did teach her so simply, but simply she remẽbred what they said.

Laur. Vaux bachelot of diuinity, in his catechisme. ca. 3. taketh awaye the 2. commãdemẽt of grauen images, & instead of that teacheth them Greeke

Written in latin by Gasper Loarte, doctor of diuinitie & translated into english fol. 76. would haue vs beleiue contrary to that which the gospel expresseth

pen vnto me, *what a ſacrament was, of the dignitie and worth of that ſacrament, and loſſe that I had, the while that I abſtained*, and other inſtructions therto belonging, as at the latter end you did, they perceiued what you were, and were noe leſſe angry vvith me for attending you therin, then offended with you for inſtructing mee that waie. They called themſelues *Catholikes*, of others they are vſually ſtiled *Papiſts*, but whatſoeuer they be in name, me thinkes their care ouer me is very good, that I ſhould enter the right waie touching my beeleife in that ſacrament.

Rom. Why? what perceaued they by my wordes of that ſacrament?

Tub. They take you to hold not Catholiklie of it, neither as our Lord and ſauiour Ieſus Chriſt did firſt inſtitute it, nor as the ancient times of 1500 yeares, by Fathers, counſels, and Doctors did; and therfore they wiſhed mee to make a ſtand, and pauſe, before I ioined with you therin; For you teach, that they who receaue it at your hands receaue *only* a peece of bread, and a draught of wine, not worth anie thing and ſo call it a ſacrament of the Lords inſtitution, wheras he gaue his bodie, his reall ſubſtantiall bodie, & ſo his diſciples did eate him realſie, and ſubſtantiallie, and dranke his verie blood, and to beleiue this is healthful, holy, & religious, and they that receaue it ſo, receaue it, as Chriſt inſtituted it, and they who doe otherwiſe, receaue noe ſacrament, but *prophane bread*, as they called it; This they did ſaie of you then, touching the difference betweene them and you in that queſtion; and that in all other things, al antiquitie & conſent of al ages were for them & nothing for you.

One of Hardings ſlanders

Rhem. 1. Cor. 11. fol. 453. in fine paginæ. Magnus nugator magno conatu magnas nobis nugas parit.

Rom: I doubt not, but they are verie bitterly eloquēt againſt vs, when opportunitie is offered of a fit audience, their tongues & pens are miſerablie valiant. But me thinketh *Tuberius*, you are ſuddenly growen rich in diſcourſe, who can ſo quicklie remember, that both Chriſt himſelfe, al ages, and all Doctors & counſells doe make for them againſt vs; ordinary abi-

abilitie cannot comprehend this in ſo ſhort time; much like vnto a ſillie gentlewoman with whom of late I talked alſo, who being not aboue one quarter of a yeare from her freinds returned home, with arguments as ſtrong as yours in defence of her new obtained religion, ſhee could talke what a good booke the *Rhemiſts bible* was, ſhe could ſaie the Scriptures were written in *Greeke* and *Latine*, and therfore people ſhold praie in latine; naie ſhe could diſtinguiſh betweene an *Idoll and an Image*, obſeruing that the ſecond commandement, was onlie directed againſt *Grauen Idolls*, as ſhe tearmed them and not againſt *Grauen Images*. And yet nether before ſhee went, nor now can ſhe read engliſh; to ſuch a method vvas ſhe brought too quickly, to knowe what ſhe ſaid. I doubt not but ſhe had bin ſo inſtructed, but not by M. *Vaux*, for he to make ſure worke, hath taken that commandement wholy out of his catechiſme (as remouing a block as belike ſtãdeth not in their waie, which noe wiſe man will euer beſtowe anie labour about) recompencing his breuitie in that point, in telling the vſe of certaine *Greeke* words, *Latria*, *Hyperdulia & Dulia*: where a learner is taught to worſhipp anie creature in heauen or earth, and commit (as he thinketh) noe Idolatry but noe otherwiſe then if a grand theife ſhould teach a puny to ſteale by precept, and when hee had committed the fact (that is, had ſtolen indeed) ſaie it were not the deed, and ſo leaue him to the gallowes. Or if it had bin her luck to haue bin ſchooled by him that compoſed *the inſtructiõs and aduertiſements how to meditate the miſteries of the Roſary*, hee would haue taught her a more compendious waie to haue defended it by, or anie other point, then by a diſtinction, which is, although the commandement forbid vs the *worſhipping of anie Image*, yet we, for our parts maie beleiue and doe otherwiſe. For ſo hee ſaith plainlie in an other queſtion, though not of that waight, yet of that clearnes, where ſpeaking al in honor of our *bleſſed Virgin Mary*, doth not ſticke to ſaie, that our Lorde & redeemer did preſentlie after hee was riſen vp viſit his

For the Rhemiſts teſtamẽt For. Hebrew & Greeke. I ſaie not that they did teach her ſo ſimply, but ſimply ſhe remẽbred what they ſaid.

Laur. Vaux batchelor of diuinity, in his catechiſme. ca. 3. taketh awaye the 2. commãdemẽt of grauen images, & inſtead of that teacheth them Greeke

Written in latin by Gaſper Loarte, doctor of divinitie & tranſlated into engliſh fol. 76. would haue vs beleiue contrary to that which the goſpel expreſſeth

his moſt holie mother, vvhom we maie vvel beleiue to haue bin the firſt, albeit in the Goſpel, there be noe mentiō made therof; For, ſaith he, if (as the Evangeliſt reporteth) our Lord did, after he was riſen vp appeare to S. *Peter* that had earſt denied him, whie ſhould not wee beleiue that hee appeared firſt to his bleſſed mother that neuer denied him? Here is a plaine leſſon, a graunt that the Scripture teacheth ſo and ſo, & yet vvee maie beleiue otherwiſe. Thus as their affections lead them, either to the things or perſōs wherof they ſpeak, ſo doe they in their conceipts bend the courſe of their arguments; Others amongſt them, ad thoſe of the greateſt doe re ferre this appearing of our Lord to Saint *Peter*, reckoning it amongſt his prerogatiues, as *Bellarmine*, whoe affirmeth that Chriſt riſing, appeared to S. *Peter* firſt of al his diſciples, confirming it by *S. Lukes* Goſpel, and the witneſſe of S *Ambroſe*, who ſaith that of the men Chriſt appeared to *Peter*, for before (ſaith he) Chriſt had appeared to *Mary Magdalene*, and that he further confirmeth out of S. *Paule*, howe that Chriſt riſing the third daie, was ſeene of Cephas and then of the Eleuen, afterward of more then 500. brethren, and after to S *Iames*. On the other ſide *Abdias* (deſcribed to be an ancient writer, firſt Biſhop of *Babylō*, who was the Apoſtles ſcholler, and ſaw our ſauiour in fleſh, and was preſent at the paſſion and martirdome of S. *Andrewe*, and S. *Mathewe*) ſpeaking in the honor of S, *Iames*, doth ſaie that our Lord woulde appeare to him firſt of all, as he did to *Mary Magdalene*, and to *Peter*; vvhich indignitie of theſe men againſt the Goſpel, & gracleſſe expoſing it vnto the worlde as vertue, is not only taxed by our learned writers, as being dealt iniuriouſly with al, but their owne Rhemiſts both confeſſe according to the truth of the text, that Chriſt appeared to *Mary Magdalene* & *Mary* of *Iames* & *Salome*, called by S. *Mathew* the other *Mary*, and acknowledge it by their note, *That ſhe firſt before al other, & they next, ſaw him after his reſurrectiō*. But the Rhemiſts ſeeing the Scripture hath giuē this prerogatiue of appearing from

Luc. 24.

De rom. pont. lib. 1. c. 20. ſinc. for S. Peter, a boue al the diſciples.

1. Cor. 15.

Abdias Apoſt. hiſt. l. 6. fol. 188

Hard. cont. Iuell art. 1. fo 25.

Ei primum omnium vt & Mariæ Magdalenæ & Petro appareret voluit.

Reyn. confer. with Hart c. 8. diu. 2.

Sutc. cont. Bel. de rom. pont. l. 2. c. 6.

Rhem. Marc. 16. v. 1. Mat. c. 28. 1.

from *Peter* to the woemen, will ſtretch hard, but euen touching that, ſome what in it, ſhalbe his prerogatiue; for when the weomen are bidden to *tel it to the Diſciples* & *to Peter* they ſay *Peter is named in ſpeciall (as often elſwhere) for prerogatiue*. It is ſaid of *Midas*, that he wiſhed every thinge he did touch, might be gold, I thinke they are as ſo manie Midaſſes, every thing they deale in maketh for *Peters* prerogatiue; a ſimple prerogatiue I thinke it is for him to bee named after all the Diſciples.

Tub. Here bee ſhrewd accuſations indeed, they accuſe you, and you accuſe them, on whom ſhal I & ſuch other that ſtand in doubt betweene you, relie? They are very famous for their learning and paines taken in defence & iuſtification of their cauſe, their volumes and bookes are many, and it maie be your replies & anſwers are as large, but here is the doubt who ſaith true.

Rom. Indeed it cannot chuſe but pitty everie good mā in behalfe of his vnlearned brother, to ſee his conſcience thus aſſalted this daie, with ſo contrarie doctrines of religion, eſpecially when there is a zeale to followe, and men knowe not what, and would faine pleaſe God, and cannot tell how, or if they finde not themſelues armed with Gods holie ſpirit, nor are able to diſcerne their meat from poiſon, nor to wind thē ſelues out of the ſnares, for Sathan tranſformeth himſelfe into an Angel of light; the wicked are more watchful & vehement then the Godly, and falſhood is oftentimes painted & beautified, & ſhineth more glorious then the truth. Theſe be the things which as S. *Paule* ſaith *worketh the ſubuerſion of the hearers*, and by meane wherof, as Chriſt ſaith if it were poſſible, the very elect of God ſhoulde bee deceaued. Notwithſtanding, God in theſe daies hath ſo amazed the aduerſaries of his Goſpel, and hath cauſed them ſo openly and ſo groſſly, to laie abroad their follies to the ſight and face of all the world, that noe man now bee hee neuer ſo ignorant, can thinke he may be iuſtly excuſed; it is but *tolle, lege*, take vp & read.

Iuell to the reader in the def. of the Apologie

2. Cor. 11.

2. Tim. 2.

Mat. 24.

read, read and vnderstand by Gods assistance. But the indiscretion of manie in the world that doe stand doubtful of the truth betweene them & vs, is equivalent and semblable to that answere which I once hard a Master giue to on that had bin his Factor, (or rather indeed his fractor) in a case not vnlike to this, about some difference betweene them of accoũts; the Factor pleaded his innocencie and truth, by the plainenesse of his proceedings, in deliuering his bills and reckonings to his Master from time to time to be examined; his M. replied, you haue so done indeed, but you knowe that I neither did nor would looke on them, nor examine thẽ. I foũd by that answere, that the reason whie the Master would not nor had anie liking to veiw them, was, because hee woulde haue libertie at anie time as occasion serued to say *he could not tell whether his man deceaued him or not*. Wheras if hee had but taken the paines to haue examined his mans dealings, hee might haue bin assured, to haue found how he had behaued himselfe towards him, whether true or false: so fareth it in these daies with vs, painfull workes there are enough, some of great volume, some slighter, al concerning the truth of our cause, which all men maie see and read, but that which galeth vs, and most tieth our aduersaries to themselues and their errors is, that they who condemne vs, knowe vs not, whether we be white or black they neuer obserue, who say we are heretickes & dispisers of the Church, and yet neuer read what we hold, nor examine vs in any thinge that we doe, as publikely complaineth a great scholler of our side, and I my selfe haue oft had experiẽce. And therfore in few words betweene them and vs, I can saie as the ancient father *Arnobius* said against the Gentiles; whẽ they accused the christians of those things, wherof themselues were guiltie; even in the verie entrance of his conference he testifieth roundly to the world, in these words *Efficietur enim profecto rationum consequentium copulatu, vt non impij nos magis, sed illi ipsi reperiantur criminis ipsius rei, quo numinum profitentur esse cultores atq; inueteratis religi-*

It is noe baseneſſe for the greateſt to descend & looke into their own eſtate. Bacon ſE. of expẽce.

Albi an atri simus, nescium.

D. Doue of Recusancy. c. 2.

Arnob. contra Gentes. lib. 1. in princip.

Religionibus deditos. It shalbe proued (saith he) by the ioining of our reasons to gether, that we are not so wicked, as they lay to our charge, but that themselues are founde guiltie of that wherof they accuse vs, who doe professe themselues worshippers of the Gods, and only retainers of *the ancient religions.* But if you or any other wilbe amated with anie streame of words to beleiue that part, without looking into the matter, reasons proofes, drifts and arguments of al sides, wherby you maie rightly iudge indeed, the same Father telleth you againe *Quid est enim quod humana ingenia labefactare studio contradictionis non audeant?* what is it saith he that the witts of some mē dare not ruinate with the studie of cōtradictiō? yea although that which they studie to ouerthrowe, be pure and clear and hedged with truth on everie side, and who cannot (saith hee) dispute with arguments of great liklihood, yea although he defend a manifest vntruth & lye? The roote of this error & vaine consequēce he toucheth in the next words following *Cum enim sibi persuaserit quis esse quid aut non esse, amat quod opinatur asserere.* When a man hath perswaided himselfe, that anie thing is so, or not so, he then loueth what he apprehendeth, and desireth to excell others in sharpnesse of wit, especialliy if the matter which is dealt in be remote, hid, or darke. But God be thanked those learned diuines & reuerend prelats before mentioned, and a number other in this age, with their infinite toile and paine haue threshed and winnowed for vs the doctrine and differences of the Church of Rome, and this of England, they haue performed the first part of the Apostles speech which willeth *to trie all things*, the latter part resteth vpon vs to followe, *that that which is good bee kept*; nether can there be *a keeping of that which is good*, without *a triall of all things* doe goe before; so that I dare pronounce there is none who maie not if he will, see on which side the truth is, & to this purpose I doe remember a sentence of the Godly and learned father S. *Augustine*, which is *Ignorantia in eis qui intelligere noluerunt, sine dubitatione peccatum est.* Ignorance

Arnob. ibid. l. 3 fol. 102.

1. Thess. 5. 21

Epist. 105. M.

rance in them which are not willng to learne, without doubt it is sinne, in them which cannot learne, a punishment of sin; In both there is noe iust excuse, but iust damnation.

Tub. It sinketh not into my head, that men otherwise learned and verie religious, should so wilfully hoodwincke themselues against the truth; as in this last declaration it seemeth you meane they doe; for besides their owne words (and few of their bookes haue I yet seene) in iustification of themselues; I see a famous Catholike Church of theires I meane Rome, who hath bin and yet is renowned for succession of Bishops, and continuance of Apostolike doctrine, vvhose gouernor & head is the Pope, vvho keepeth it in the same integritie, and soundnesse of doctrine, that S. *Peter* our Lords cheife Apostle vvhose successor hee is, did, vvhen hee sate, and ruled there as he doth now. I tell you I haue a table of the Bishops of Rome from *S. Peter* to *Clemens* the eight, vvho latly deceased as the speech was. You cannot shew me the like of any Church in the world, but of that. Al churches saue a fewe of late yeeares, haue euer acknowledged that Church for the mother and head of them al, and whatsoeuer was amisse vvas thither referred and determined, & therfore if you will oppose your selfe against them or their religion, you had need bringe sound arguments, or else they wilbee quickly confuted.

This hath bin and yet is, maketh all the error. Iulius Cæsar was once faithful to the Romans; but affecting Souranitie he cõtinued not so: so the Church of Rome was a great church amongst the rest: But now it beareth witnes of it selfe, as Simon Magus said That hee was somegreat mã Act. 8. 9. Their vsual tables in writing which they giue to their freinds containing a Catalogue of the Bish. of Rome.

Rom. See now, you require that of mee already, vvhich you cannot performe your selfe. To enter into the discussing of the points of doctrine vvhich concerne either side, you haue neither abilitie nor iudgment, by reason you are but newly begun to be tutered by them; And then if I shoulde of my selfe discourse of them vnto you, you vvould in the end say of my labour therin, as a merrie fellow in Wilteshire said of an hare in a course with his dogge: when my dogge was let slip at the hare (quoth he) she went forth right, & was before my dogge some foure acres bredth; But my dogge fetcht her and gaue her a turne, and awaie she goes againe, & then

then he gaue her another, and did beat her, ſo that ſhe had many turnes & wrenches; but in the end (quoth he) the hare went awaie, and had nether turne nor wrench: ſo if I ſhould ſhew vnto you the vnſoūdnes of the doctrine of the church of Rome from ſcriptures, Fathers, Counſells, & Doctors, yea & of the intruſions of Biſhops into that ſea, which you (from them) call ſucceſſion, you would giue me the hearing, & how ſoever I did beat the hare, in giuing her manie wrentches & turnes, yet you would ſaie ſhe went from me in the end, and had nether turne nor wrentch. I am not ignorant in what painted Cyphers, the Catholikes did of late, agreable to your report of them, ſet forth their religion, calling it *venerable for antiquitie, maieſticall for amplitude, conſtant for continuance, irreprehenſible for doctrine, inducing to all kind of vertue and pietie, diſſuading from all ſin & wickednesſe; A religiō beloued by all primitiue Paſtors, eſtabliſhed by all Oecumenicall counſells, vpheld by al anciēt doctors, maintained by the firſt and moſt Chriſtian Emperours, recorded almoſt alone in all Eccleſiaſticall hiſtories, ſealed with the blood of millions of Martyres, adorned with the vertues of ſo manie confeſſors, beautified with the puritie of thouſands of Virgins, ſo conformable to naturall ſence and reaſon, and finally ſo agreable to the ſacred text of Gods word and Goſpell.* Of which ſpeech of theirs I will ſaie noe otherwiſe nowe, then *Tacitus* doth of *Vitellius* the Emperour of Rome in theſe words. *The daie following* (ſaith he) as though he had ſpoken, before the Senate and people of a ſtrange Citty, he made a glorious ſpeech of himſelfe, extolling his owne induſtrioſneſſe and temperancie; whenas they vvhich hard him, of their owne knowledge, vvere witneſſes of his lewd actions, & al Italy beſides, through which he marched for drowſineſſe and riot notoriouſly infamous. There are two notable pillars which vphold the Church of Rome in al her buildings, vnknown to you yet, (but heraf ter better may be) againſt which if yon leane, they wil ſurely deceaue you; on is. *The Church of Rome cannot erre whatſoeuer it teacheth*, the other *The Biſhop of Rome ought not to bee accuſed*

In the 1. petitiō to his Maieſtie

Adde fidem dictis. Ovid. Medea. 1as

Cor. Tac. hiſt. l. 2. c. 27.

Two pillers wherof the Papiſts muſt reſt. Whitak. cont. Dureum l. 9. de Sophis.

what soeuer he doe. Vpon such pillars as these they maie reare what vvorke they wil; and so they doe, but it fareth with thē as it was wont to the false Prophets, *One buildeth vp an muddy wall, and others dawbe it over with a rotten plaister.* But because it hath pleased God to bringe vs againe thus luckely to gether, I wil bend our conference for this time to some good purpose, that you goe not altogether awaie without profite. Will you graunt mee but so much, as common humanitie will afford anie man, or the meanest courtesie of freindes allowe?

Exech. 13. 10.

Tub. I wil alowe you any reasonable graunt, whereof if you doubt, you doe me wronge; it may be you deeme me so affectioned, that I wil neither heare nor read anie thinge against my humor, I would not haue you so thinke of me, that were more beastlike to follow the first of the heard, then according to anie Christian course; and if anie should wish me to it, I should the sooner mistract them, and grow the wearier of them.

Rom. You say well, and my request shalbe yet more reasonable then you would deeme it to be, you are you saie vnable to dispute of the points of doctrine betweene them & vs, vntil you be further instructed in them.

Tub. I confesse it, I haue only hetherto heard their our report, without either their proofes, or your acceptions.

Rom. Why then this I saie (which you or anie man being neuer so vnlearned maie vnderstand) if all their points of their religion, be good & sound, Catholike & according to Scriptures, Fathers, Counsells, Doctors, & histories, viz. their Masse, their sacrifice, their reall presence, their meritinge of heauen; their free wil in good and holy things; their praying to Saints; their seruice in an vnknowen tongue; the forbidding of the laye people to read the Scriptures in their vulgar tongue. The Bishop of Romes authoritie, worshiping of Images; and a number of questions else; What need then is there, for the Doctors of that side, such as haue written in defence

The points in controuersie betw. ene vs.

sence & proofe of their cause, *Harding, Dorman, Saunders, Stapleton, Allen, Cope. Bellarmine, Rhemists, Durens*, and manie others, to misaleadg any, Doctor, Counsell, Historie, or Father either by corrupting of the text, or quoting of places not to be found; to vse any vaine and foolish shifts in answere, such as any may perceaue to bee feeble & weake. to deliuer their mindes so doubtfully, that an English man in the English tongue shal not vnderstand vvhat they meane; to be so contrarie and opposite on to an other; and many times each frō himselfe, to dispute for that which they confesse, is not so ancient nor so good, as the contrary. It is an olde saying, a rich man need not bee a theife, and a good cause at their handes cannot bee lost for lack of pleading, only that which wanteth is the truth of the cause, they haue bin fashiōing of it these many yeares, & euer & anon there comme some experter masters than formerly, vvith some fresher vernish, but noe better prose; some tast of this dealing I gaue the readers be- but a more larger euidence and veiw shal follow after, in diuers of the points mentioned, that all the vvorld shal see & confesse, that the popish religion, at this day taught and professed, by the verie confused handling of it, is nothinge lesse then *ancient, catholike, and true*, which shalbe so faithfully collected, that they shal not be denied, to be their owne, and so plaine for vnderstanding, that although you conceaue little or nothing of the questions thēselues, yet you shall perceaue the weaknesse of their side, by the manner of laying downe their proofes and defences.

The Doctors that defēd thē The manner of handling them.

Peruium cunctis iter. Sence in Oct. art. 2.

Tub. When I shal see that performed substātially, which you haue here promised confidently, I wil surly stay my hād from subscribing, & my harte from consenting to anie such doctrine, as shal stand vpon such proofes.

Rom. By the grace of God I wil not faile to shew it you you shal not take any thing vpon report, you shall see and read their owne bookes and discourses themselues, and since now you are the man vnto vvhose conscience I appeale for

your consent to our side, let me shew you the dutie of a reader in a case of controuersie betweene two, noe otherwise then D. *Harding* in his Reioynder against *B. Iuell* touching them both doth lay it down to you and me, and al men else.

To the reader The dutie of a reader.

Consider I require thee (saith he) what is thy duty. Remember thou be not parciall towards either of our persons. Let all affection be laide aside. Let your conscience be the rule of both loue & hatred. Let neither hope nor feare haue place in your hart, to win or loose by either of our fortunes, yea if you can so conceaue let our bookes represent vnto thee, not Iuell & Harding, but two men Iohn & Thomas departed this worlde, to noe man hauing knowen to haue liued. And when you haue left of all affection touching our persons, then study to discharge thy minde of all blind parciality towards both our doctrines, abandoning all humane likings and carnall phantasies & with a single eie, & simple hart, behold & imbrace what is good & true, only for loue of God, and for the truthes sake. Being thus disposed, commend your selfe vnto God with praier, beseeching him to lighten your vnderstanding & by his holie Spirit to lead you vnto the truth. This done with an humble hart, read both our Treatises and iudge: yet this much I saie in case of necessitie, not to all in generall, but to certaine, such as by other meanes will not bee induced to consider of the truth; for otherwise I acknowledge, that both the REPLY, and all other heretical bookes by order of the Church, without speciall licence, bee vnlawfull to be read, and are vtterlie forbidden to bee read or kept, vnder paine of excõmunicatiõ. Remember I saue the part of a iudge is, to iudge (as the Lawyers speake) secundum allegata & probata, that is to saie, as things be alleadged & proued. Beware everie thing is not proued for which authorities bee alleadged, neither is all made good, which by probable arguments seemeth to be concluded. Allegations must be true, plaine & simple, neither weakned by taking awaie, nor strengthened by putting to of words, nor wrested from the sence they beare in the writer: else they bewraie the feebleuesse of the cause for proofe whereof they be alleadged, & also the great vntruth of thõ that for furtherance of their purpose abuseth them: if they haue corrupted their witnesses, or brought in false witnesses, if they haue vntruly

The reply, is that which B. Iuell wrot against him.

Nota bene.

truly reported their Doctors, & shamfully falsified their sayings, the ought you to giue sentence against them, then is their honestie stained, then is their credit defaced, and then is their challenge quite dashed. Thus farr D. *Harding*. And *Pilate* tooke water and washed his handes before the multitude, saying, I am innocent of the bloud of this iust man: euen so cleare is M. *Hardinge* and his fellowes frō misreporting the Doctors, or falsifying their sayings, or in not committing any thing wherof they would seeme to be most free, as anon shal appeare. Mat. 27. 24.

Tub. Me thinketh, by these words of D. *Harding* & by your request made before vnto me, that both parties on both sides, require nothing more then that al their readers should ponder & waighe the allegations, & proofes both of the one side, & other, and then iudge of the truth accordingly: but I feare he meaneth nothing lesse, because he saith that both the *REPLY*, & al other heretical books, by order of the church without speciall licence, bee vnlawfull to bee read or kept, which inference abridgeth the libertie of reading, & consequently of iudging by any indifferent way or meane, to come to the knowledge of the truth: For the heathen Poet could deliuer a good speech to that purpose, by the very light of naturall discourse By hereticall bookes hee meaneth the protestants writings.

Qui statuit aliquid parte inaudita alterâ
Æquum licet statuerit, haud æquus fuit. Senec in Med A. 2.

He that not hearing either part, pronounceth his decree, Vnrighteous mā accounted is, though right his sentence be.

Rom. I did includ so much in mine owne speech vnto you before, but that perhaps you wil sooner approue of your owne obseruation, then my collection. And to tel you truly which you shal certainly find by conuersing more with the, they doe not suffer the common laitie amongst them to see or read or heare any thinge *without speciall licence*, & so much and such parcells, as it shal please them. But those that they knowe are so stiffe and obstinate that nothing will awaken their vnderstanding, perhaps they will giue some small li-

ber-

bertie of reading, the better to colour their denial to others. And this doe they not only touching the vse or reading either of the holy scriptures, or of the protestants bookes, but they forbid the vse of part of the sacraments without their leaue; For the same *Doctor* in other places of his workes avoucheth the *Church*, hath libertie to take away the vse of wine in the administration of the Lords supper from you of the Laitie, and to restore it againe, vpon their liking & considerations. And in an other Article, he limitteth you so that you shal not reade the holy bible, without licence and leaue obtained; because as hee saith God by speciall prouidence kept the vulgar people of the Iewes from reading the old testament *That precious stones should not be cast before swine*, that is to say, *such as be not called therto, as being for their vnreuerent curiosity & impure life, vnworthy.*

Hard. cont. Iuell art. 2. fol. 56

In the counsell of Basil the vse of the cup was grãted to the Bohemias: because that custom was then amongst them

Geneb. Chronic. l. 4. f. 1067

Hard. art 15. read the whol but especially fol. 195.

Ibid. fol 198. b

Freder. Staph. In Apol Mat. 7. 6.

Swine & Doggs.

Hard. Reioind fol. 63.

Duii. 7. fol. 14.

Staphilus an other of that side commended by D. *Harding* for a man of excellent learning, & on of the Emperours coũsell that then was, did not sticke likwise to abuse a place of scripture to that purpose *Giue not that which is holy vnto doggs*. so by D. *Harding* the Laitie are accounted *Swine*, and by *Staphilus Doggs*. In which respect D. *Hardinge* needed not in his *Reioynder*, to haue charged the reuerend Bishop his aduersary for reporting his words *falsly* & *dishonestly*, as hee saith hee doth, when in the first article of the reply, the Bishop hauing said that *by some of them* (that is of that side) the common people are said to be *Doggs* & *Swine* (quoting the 15. article. fol. 155. of D. *Hardings* booke, meaneth not that M. *Harding* did vse both those tearmes of *Doggs* & *Swine*, but that hee vsed one of them; & *some others* of his fellowes the other; M. *Hardinge* not content so to vnderstand him, maketh an vndiscreet noise, and biddeth *read the place who will, & hee shall finde M: Iuell an vtter reporter, & himselfe cleare of that odious sayings* (as if it were so capitall a crime; to put both them wordes on him that shall vse but one of them) *For in that place* (saith he) *is not so much as the name of Doggs*. but there is of *Swine* say I: &

so

so you haue from M. *Harding* the same answere in effect, that a simple fellow gaue to those that asked him, howe hee had sped against those that would hauebegged him, because of his vnsufficiency to gouerne himselfe & his affaires: I haue done wel enough with them (quoth hee) for where they thought to haue *proued me a foole*, the best was, they coulde *finde me but an Idiot*.

Neither are *Stapbilus* & *Harding* the first who haue made such account of the people of God as to account thē *Dogges* & *Swine* their masters before them *Peter Lumbard* & *Thomas* of *Aquine*, hath refered that text of *Iob Boues arabant, & asinæ pascebantur iuxta eos*, The Oxen were ploughing, & the Asses were feeding in their places, to the Preists & people; taking the Oxen ploughing to signifie the Preists reading of the scripture, & the Asses feeding, to be the people not troubling their heads with such matters, *Credunt enim quæ ignorant, habentes fidem velatam in mysterio*, For they beleiue they knowe not what (saith Lumbard) hauing their faith foulded vp in generalities. Thus doe some of thē cal the *Laity Dogges*, some others *Swine*, & others compare them to *Asses*. O that they would wipe their faces from these spots, before they call vs black or ill fauoured!

Lumb. sent. l. 3 dist 25. b. Tho. Aq. 2. 2. quæst. 2. a. 6. ad. contra. Iob. 1. 14. Minores significabantur per asinos, debent in credēdis non herere maiora sed qui per boues significabantur vt Gregor exponit. 1. moraliū

Tub. If we that be of the Laitie, bee noe more accounted of by them, then you haue laid downe out of their owne bookes, our knowledge & iudgment shalbee lesse then they are, if they can tell howe to keepe vs vnder. And I perceaue they can tell wel enough if they maie deterre vs from reading the word of God by such collections, as those which you haue recited.

Ram. *Hic fige pedem.* Doe but here staie your footing, & I will shew you far more abhominations then these. The wresting & rocking of such places of scriptures as these, some to one purpose, & some to an other, did make *Polydorus Virgilius* a verie great papist who liued here in Englād in the reigne of *Henry 7.* to giue but an homly censure of them. For intreating

Ezec. 8. 6. 15.

Polid. Virgil. de inuent. rerū l. 4. c. 9. f. 337. 338.

ting of the antiquitie of Cardinalls at Rome (he saith) there bee some who haue deduced the originall of them from the Hebrewes *more eorum qui cum obscuri sint inani nobilitatis nomine sibi blandientes, alius ad Achillem, alius ad Æneam, alius ad Numam Pompilium suum genus referunt*; as those are wont whoe beeing base of themselues deriue their pedigree some from *Achilles*, some from *Aenas*, & others from *Numa Pompilius*. And so did one *Siculus Andreas Barbatius*, who to get in fauour with *Bessarius* the Cardinal, put forth a Commentary to that purpose; But saith *Polidore* because I will not wearie my selfe any further with quoting of the man, you shal heare how he beginneth himselfe, writing of that matter. *Occurrit inquit illud quod 1 Regum cap. 2. pulcherrimè scriptum est. Domini enim sunt cardines terræ & posuit eos super orbem*. That saith *Siculus* is further to be remembred which is excellently written, in the 1 booke of the Kings, & 2 chap, The pillers of the earth are the Lords, & he hath set the world vpon thē: which text of scripture *Hostiensis* the great Doctor doth referre to bee meant of *Cardinalls*. For as the dore is turned vpon the heng, so is the Church of Rome gouerned by the Colledg of Cardinalls. Thus far *Barbatius*. Now followeth the mislike of *Polidore*, for their handling of holie scriptures so prophanely, *vide nos secus isti. Iuris consulti aliquoties detorquent sacras literas quo volunt, ac sutores sordidas solent dentibus extendere pelles*. See (saith hee) these same Canonists or Lawiers doe diuers times wrest the holy scriptures whether they list, as shomakers doe wrest & retch their leather with their teeth.

The originall of Cardinalls.

Ipse iam incipiat suum narrare commentū. According to our english translations. 1. Sam. c. 2. v. 8

Hostiensis a most famous popish doctor.

Polydore misliketh the papists for tacking the scriptures in that manner.

Tub. Surely the comparison of *Polidore* is more cleanlie, then their dealing with the scriptures is tolerable; Be these they that pretend such holinesse & zeale to the holy scriptures? It appeareth not by their dealing they doe so: Laie mē would carrie a more religious and more reuerend regard of those sacred Oracles thē such church men doe for ought that I see. But I perceaue they keep the Laitie from reading, because they should not vnderstand, their interpretatiōs if such

wrest

wrestings may be tearmed interpretations.

Rom Now iudge you, how cā their questiōs be testified and proued out of the holy scripture, when the sentences of holy scripture are so far of from them, frō which they would drawe the truth of their assertions? If the foundation bee not settled, the building wil euer totter. I doubt not but many amongst them, see the confusion of their cause euen at hand nay I dare apply that speech of *Arnobius* aga inst thē which he did against the *Gentiles*, *Non nobis est sermo cum hominibus rationis expertibus, neq; quibus non sit communis intelligentiæ veritas*. We spend not our talke with men who are void of reasō, nor with those who haue not a common simplicity of vnder standing; you haue wisdome, you haue sence *verumq; nos dicere apud vos ipsi interiore iudicio scitis* & you knowe in your most innermost thoughts thet we saie true. But what can we doe to those, that wil not sift the truth themselues to the quick, & *dispute euē* with themselues; you doe that which you see done, not that which you iudge ought to be done, verily because *Custome* hauing noe reason with it, doth more sway with you *quam rerum inspecta natura veritatis examinatione pōderata*, then substance of matter examined according to the waight of truth. Now to goe a little further, touching that sentence of *Polidors* mislike of their racking of the scripture to shew that they would make sure worke, if they could tell how; & since I cannot lay too much to their charg that they deale against vs, as against their owne consciences,; I wil tel you how they wil deale with their own Polidore: They reading that sentence in his booke, to make against them, doe commande that it bee *corrected & put out*, as by their *Index expurgatorius* appeareth.

Qui pote est habere idoneā id, quod sequitur causam, cū ipsum illud primum à quo defluit sēcundum inanissimum esse reperiatur & vacuum, & nulla soliditate firmatum? Arnob. cont Gent. l. 7 fol. 268

Arn. ib. fol. 278 Sed quid facere possumus cōsiderare nolētibus penitus res ipsas secūq; ipsos loqui?

Corrigenda sunt atq; delenda.

Tub. To be corrected and put out, as by their Index expurgatorius appeareth, what meane you by that? I vnderstād you not, is it a booke, or what is it?

Rom It is a little book gathered together in manner of a *table* or index, with warrant enough by the decree of the

Tridentine counsell, by the authoritie and commandement of the Catholike Kinge Phillip the second, and by the aduise and furtherance of the Duke of *Alba*. The drift of it is this, Where there are diuers volumes & bookes (for the vse of schollers both Protestants & Papists as Fathers & doctors diuine and humane, because they will haue nothing come to their schollers sight, that shal make against the Church of Romes doctrine, by the paines of diuers men, they haue run ouer a number of writers *Diuines*, *Lawiers*, *Phisitians*, *Philosophers*, *Mathematicians*, & *humanists*, & haue quoted the places that offended them in this *Index*, & could their schollers that they must either correct them in the bookes, or *wipe thē out*, if they doe chance to studie anie of those bookes there named, dash them out with a pen, doe anie thing with them, so they rise not vp in iudgment against them. Amongst all which authors, *Polidore Virgil* is one, in whose poore booke they haue willed to bee *mangled* & *blotted* out aboue an hundred seuerall places, of all which it seemeth they are fowly ashamed. Instances I could produce manie, but that it is not material in a case so cleare, one or two maie suffice. In another place, speaking of the cheife heads of the *Commandemēts* he reckoneth this for the second, *Nullius animalis effigiem colito*. Thou shalt not worship the likenesse of anie liuing creature. The collectors of the *Index*, doe command that sentēce to be wiped out: and not to be read at anie hand. If they bee not afraid that the second commandement against grauen Images is directly against them, whie doe they take it out of their Catechismes as *Vaux*, and wipe it out as they doe here? Their index doth yet more miserablie bewray them, for in shewing how the *ancient Treatises of* a *Bertrame* a priest which teacheth as we doe, of the sacrament of the altar, may be suffered to passe for good, if it be amended, doe testifie to the world. *That they can by some deuised shifts, deuise what soeuer errors they finde in the ancient fathers, & extenuate them, and deuise an apt sence to anie of their testimonies, whensoeuer they shal be vrged by the ad-*

luxta saeri cōcilij Tridentini decretum; Philippi 2. regis catholici iussu & authoritate, atq; Albani ducis cōsilio a ministerio in Belgia concinnatus, anno 1571.

Pol. Vir. de inuer. l. 5. c. 9. fol. 435.

Vt Liber Bertrami Presbyt. de corp. & sāg. domini tolerari emendatus queat. fol. 11. 12. in Indice.

adversaries in disputations and conferences; & they see noe reason, whie they should not vse that equitie & diligence towards *Bertrame*, as towards the rest of the Fathers, *Scelera quæ quisq; ausus est, hoc vicit malum*. This dealing passeth al that cā be imagined. They that gather the Index confesse that this *Bertrame* was verie famous and beloued of two Emperours; Charles the great & Charles the Bald, And *Genebrard incerteth*, that about the yeare of our Lord 877. a question beeing made in the sacrament *whether the eating be corporall or spiritual*, *Paschasius* the Abbot wrot therof learnedly; And coverrly corrected manie things, which *Bertrame* the preist had writē therof a little before vnto Charles the Bald, not so fitly and so skilfully as he should: so wee maie perceaue by *Genebrard* aswel as by the gatherers of the Index, that *Bertrams* booke is a great block in their waie.

Non videmus cur non eandē æquitatem & diligentem recognitionem mereatur Bertramus Ind. ib. Senec. in Here Oeti. Act, 3. Geneb. Chron l. 4. fol. 790. Nonnulla tacitè corrigens quę de ea quęstione Bertramus Presb. paulo ante minus scitè & cōmode ad Carolū Calvum rescripserat.

Tub. If this booke doe so manifestly discouer their trechery, as by your report it appeareth it doth; would they suffer it, to come in sight to be knowen of you, who they knewe would accept against it, and also make a great historie of it?

Rom. Noe I warrant you, they never ment it should be seene of anie Protestant, they were sending it to their owne Vniuersities & schooles of learning beyond the seas, & as it was a going was intercepted; The verie Authenticall booke of their owne impression *singulari numinis prouidentiâ* by gods prouidence was brought to a great Protestant, who toke the pains for thē to send it by copies, vnto al Protestāt Churches in Christendome, so that that birth of theirs, which like another monster they were diuers daies and nights in bringing forth, & thought when they had brought it forth, to haue stifled it between their knees, doth now liue in good liking, through good cherishing, but to the perpetuall infamie of the parents. An other helpe like vnto that before in effect, they doe also vse to make their schollers to thinke that the ancient Doctors of the Church doe all make for them. The elder schollers and those that read vnto the rest, take paines

Ex officina Christophori Plant. an. 1571. Iun. in epist. ad illustrissimum principem Ioannem Casimirum. Hunc fœtum genuerunt illi sed nascentem inter genua sua presserunt.

moſt in the controuerſies, & hauing found what liketh thē to confirme their doctrine doe write it in breife & deliuer it in notes to their ſchollers, out of their written ſheetes, neuer ſuffering them to looke into the doctors originalls themſelues; ſo that whenſoeuer it pleaſe the Maſters to coggerly either by adding or abating the text which they finde, the ſchollers are deceaued & abuſed, thinking ſuch & ſuch authorities doe make for them, when if the grounds bee looked into, they ſhew nothing leſſe, then they quote them for; which dealing of the Maſters with their owne ſchollers, cauſed a faithfull teacher of this land, to wiſh his Concumbatāt for his owne good, to looke into the originall books themſelues for proofe of that which he was to diſpute of, becauſe he knewe hee would otherwiſe bee deceaued, if hee truſted thoſe on whom he meant to relie, which was the greateſt & freeſt liberty, that could be graunted to anie man.

Reinolds conference with Hart. c. 1. diuiſ. 1. fol. 4.

Thus much haue I bin willing to ſhew by the way at firſt, touching their politick (but not religious) courſes, in aſtoniſhing the world, vvith that religion, vvhich only is boulſtred out, by manie indirect courſes, perceaued euerie day more & more. I wil now according to my firſt intent goe forward to ſet before your eies, the manie differences and implications, which they vſe in expreſſing their minds in that queſtion of the ſacrament, betweene them & vs, remembring here noe other thinge then that which themſelues doe euer giue in charge, to be regarded & adviſed vpon, & to be ioined with that good counſel of D. *Hardinge* ſet down before. Amongſt manie other proofs (ſaith *Gardiner*) whereby truth after much trauaile in contention at the laſt preuaileth & hath victorie, there is none more notable then when the verie aduerſaries of truth, (who pretend neuerthe leſſe to be truthes freinds) doe by ſome euident vntruth bewraie themſelues. For on that part ever is the truth where al ſayings & doings appear vniformely, conſonāt to the truth pretended; And on what ſide a notable lie appeareth, the reſt maie be iudged after the

Bic. habent principia ſeſe Ter. in. Phor. 4 & 3. ſcen. 1.

In the explication of the true catholike faith in the ſacrament. f. 4. b

Then is the doctrine of the Church of Rome not the truth, as ſhall manifeſtly appeare hereafter.

ſame

same sort, *for truth needeth nee aide of lies, craft or slight, wherwith to be supported & maintained.* So that in the intreating of the truth of this high & ineffable mysterie of the sacrament, on what part thou seest craft, shift, slight, or obliquitie, or in anie one point an open manifest lie, there thou maiest consider whatsoeuer pretence bee made of truth, yet the victorie of truth not to be there intended, which loueth simplicitie, plainnesse, direct speech, without admixture of shift or colour. Thus farre *Gardiner.* NOTE WEL

To this purpose also speaketh D. *Saunders*, *Protestantium inter se dissensiones certissimam fidem faciunt doctrinæ veritatem non penes illos, verum penes ecclesiam Romanam esse.* The dissen De visibili mo-nar. l. 7. f. 627. tions amongst the Protestants (saith he) doe make evident proofe, that the truth is not on their sides, but altogether on the Church of Romes, wherin amongst the beleiuers, there is one hart, one soule, & on tongue, vnder one Pastor the Pope. Now, if (notwithstanding their braggs of truth, & evidence of truth, & nothing but truth on their side) there doe fall out in searching of their bookes, that they doe nothing lesse thē further that, which they most extol, I hope you will not laie the fault & blame on me, that doe but shew that so they doe, but rather on them, whoe deliuer such matter. *Si illum obiurges vitæ qui auxilium tulit, quid facias illi qui dederit damnum aut malum?* saith the Poet. If you blame him that shal further your health by his best indeauour, what wil you doe to an other, that shal seeke to bring you into danger? But indeed all their clamours against vs, or petite glozes in defence of themselues, or faire admonitions to their readers, to beware of vs, are but as that accusation of *Publius Clodius* against *Tully*, who hauing himselfe sacrilegiously abused certaine holy things appertaining to the Temple, and fearing least *Tully* would accuse him in the senate, first complained of him that all religion, was prophaned in his house. Terenc. in An-dr. act. 1. scen. 1. Actor. P. Clodius ædilis Reus, suique patronus Cicero acta in sen. anno. Ciceronis 51. vrbis. 697. de haruspicū respōsis.

Tub. I both perceaue what you would saie, as also what you are willing I should conceaue touching their dealing in these

theſe matters. Goe to the queſtion of the ſacrament I pray you, becauſe in that they pretend moſt perſpicuitie & cleare neſſe.

Rom. I knowe they doe, In confidence wherof, on that
Camp. rat 3. was great amongſt them once ſaid, *Adhuc duriſſima partes Caluini ſunt, noſtræ faciles & explicatæ.* Moreouer the Proteſtãts are verie harſh in this queſtion, but our arguments are cleare & expedite, which whether it be ſo or noe iudge you. The
Conc: Trid. ſeſſ. 13. can. 1. counſell of Trent (which they al follow; & on whom they al depend in this and all other points) hath thus defined therof *Si quis negauerit &c.* If anie man ſhal denie that in the ſacrament of the holy Euchariſt, there is not contained *verè, realiter & ſubſtantialiter*, truly, really, & ſubſtantially, the body & blood, together with the *ſoule*, & *diuinitie* of our Lord & ſauiour Ieſus Chriſt, & in that reſpect *whole Chriſt*, let him bee accurſed *negauerit 2, mirabilem illam, & ſingularem conuerſionem*
Can. 2. *totius ſubſtantiæ panis in corpus* or ſhal denie that maruelous & only converſion of the *whole ſubſtance of* the bread, *into the body*, and of the whole ſubſtance of the wine *into his blood*, the ſhowes of bread & wine only remaining, which conuerſion the catholike Church doth aptly call *Tranſubſtantiation*; let
Can. 8. him be accurſed. gaine, if anie man ſaie, That Chriſt is exhibited or ſet forth in the Euchariſt, to the intent to bee eaten *ſpiritually*, & not alſo *ſacramentally*, & *really*, let him be accurſed. Not to ſpeake heare, how blaſphemous & contrary this their doctrine is to the holy inſtitution of Chriſt at his laſt ſupper, the verie manner of their handling, & ſeting downe their opinions is by their leaues erronious, & yet not vnder ſtood by their owne Doctors.

For firſt, it muſt follow of their words, if the whol ſubſtãce of the bread be turned into Chriſts body, then is the body of Chriſt made of bread; as is verified in the decrees, which
De Conſ. diſt. 2. can. vtrum ſub figura. ſaith *The bodie of Chriſt & his blood by the power of the holy ghoſt is made of the ſubſtance, of bread and wine.* Then will it follow, that it is not that bodie which was made of the fleſh & blood

of

of the virgin *Mary*. D. *Harding* seeing this impietie of making our saiuour Christ haue two contrary bodies, both auoideth his own authorities, & ouerthroweth his *Transubstantiation*: for thus he saith, Where the bodie & blood of Christ is said to be made of *bread & wine*, beware thou vnlearned mã, thou thinke not them therefro bee made, as though they were newly created *of the matter of bread and wine*, nether that they be made of bread & wine as of a matter: but that where bread & wine were before, after consecration there is the verie bodie & blood of Christ borne of the verie substance of the *Virgin Mary*. To say where bread was before, there is the bodie of Christ, as M. *Harding* saith: is a *departing, or annihilation* of the bread, *a comming of it as it were to nothing*, & not a transubstantiation, *a turning of the substance* of the bread into the *substance* of the bodie of Christ, as the Trent fathers define. Againe, if bread be made the body of Christ, or is the bodie of Christ, as they are willing to grant; why shoulde it not be said, to be made of bread as of a matter? If it bee made of the substance of bread, why not made of bread, as of a matter? Againe, They themselues teach vs, that a sacrament is a *signe of an holy thinge*, or a visible signe of an invisible grace; so that on two things doth a sacrament consist by both our cõsents: Now least there should be anie strife what those two things are, they teach moreouer, that the on is *earthly*, & the other *heauenly*, so they al teach out of *Irenæus* that ancient father; who saith this being not commõ bread, but the Eucharist after consecration, consisting of two things, *earthly*, & *heauenly*, what that earthly thing is, al men may vnderstãd that wel, to be verie bread, the substance of bread, except he bee driuen to say as al they doe in those places quoted, that by the *earthly thing* named by *Irenæus* is ment not the substance of bread but the accidents, that is, *the tast. colour, waight, show, fauour*, & *fashion*, of bread. What *earthly thinge* the tast, colour, shew, waight, and fauour of bread can bee, I appeale to anie indifferent iudge. So that to say as the Trent fathers saie, that

Hard. cont. Iuell art. 12. fol. 168

This is noe trã substantiation

Lumb. l. 4. dis. 1 b. Alan. de sac. in gener. l. 1. c. 2. Dureus cont. Whit. rat. 2 fol. 103. Hard. cont. Iuell art. 8. f. 144. b. Tonstal. l. 1. fol. 33. Allen de Euch sacra. l. 1. c. 3. fol. 217 Bellar. de euch sac. l. 2. c. 9. tol. 151. ex Iren. l. 4 cont. hær. c. 34

noe *substance* remaineth after consecration, but the real and substantial bodie of Christ is to ouerthrowe the nature of a sacrament; and to take awaie the earthly part of it, & instead of exhibiting the *Grace of Christ*; putteth the Person of Christ God & man in the roomth.

Transubstantiation ouerthroweth the nature of a sacrament.

But see how they retaine the true nature & definition of a sacrament in the one, & destroy it in the other. They saie there remaineth the nature and substance of water, & the invisible grace of the spirit; the holy Ghost commeth down & halloweth the water; there we cõsider the diuine spirit which lieth hid in the water, there wee consider our baptisme, not with the eies of our flesh, but with the eies of our soules. And as in the sacrament of Christs most precious bodie and blood we receaue Christs verie flesh & drinke his verie blood to cõtinue & augmẽt the life receaued; so in baptisme we receaue the spirit of Christ for the renuing of our life; And therfore in the same forme of words Christ spake to Nichodemus of baptisme, that he spake of the eating of his body & drinking of his blood, & in both *sacraments giueth, dispenseth, & exhibiteth indeed* those celestiall guifts in *sensible elements*. In both sacraments the blood of Christ is included; the sprinkling of our bodies with the water of Baptisme, is nothing but that the soule be washed & rinced with the blood of Christ. If all this bee verified of the sacrament of Baptisme, if Christ can giue & exhibite himselfe (as he doth indeed) vnto vs, without anie transubstantiation retaining the substance of the *element* of water, we cannot but say so of the sacrament of the supper, that there we maie feed on Christs flesh, & drink his blood, without anie transubstantiation of the bread, & wine; Nay in more plainer maner they tell vs that, Saint *Augustine* doubteth not to say of infants, & other faithfull people *Nulli est aliquatenus ambigendum*, Noe man may in anie wise doubt but that euerie faithful man is then made partaker of the bodie & blood of Christ, when in baptisme he is made a member of Christ, & that he is not without the fellowship of that bread

In both sacraments Christ is exhibiteth himselfe vnto vs.

Andr a. Ortho. expl. l. 3. f. 239.

Lumb. l. 4. dist. 9 a Torren. l. 3 c. 6. parag. 3. fine vide tale a liquid apud aug. tom 7. de peccat. merit. & remiss. l. 3. c. 4

Tonst l. 1. f. 30. & 48. b. ex. cõ. conc. Nicen. considera diuinã vim quę in aquis latet. Step. Gardin. fol. 8 b.

bread & the cup, although before hee eate of that bread and drinke of that cup, he depart this world beeing in the vnity of Christs bodie, for he is not made frustrate of the communion and benefit of that sacrament, whiles hee findeth that thinge which is signified by the sacrament. If infants and other faithfull people may be made partakers of the body and blood of Christ in the sacrament of Baptisme: I demand of our Trent fathers why we may not be made partakers of his flesh and blood of the sacrament of the aultar, without any transubstantiatiō of the bread into the body of Christ? Moreouer they hold that Christ is eaten there *sacramentally & really*; which two tearmes (as they vtter them) are very opposit; for if there be nothing to be eaten but the reall & substātiall body of Christ, what is eaten *sacramentally*? Wee affirme that Christ is there sacramentally, & is eaten sacramentally, by his spirit present, & by his grace, as hee is in the sacrament of baptisme, & that is properly *sacramentall*.

Vt ante can. 8. sacramentally & really: are 2 tearmes contrary & yet cō founded.

Againe speaking of the vse and profite of that sacrament, they say there be three sorts of *Receiuers*: some that receaue it only *sacramentally* as sinners; others *spiritually* in desire by a liuely faith, thirdly those that receaue it *sacramentally & spiritually* both to gether. Which three waies may bee taken for sound & Orthodoxall, if we could cause them to tell vs what they meane by *sacramentally*. If by sacramentally they mean really, fleshly, and substantially, as at the first they treated of his presence there, how doe they make good that *sinners* and wicked persons, doe eate his verie flesh, and drinke his verie blood, as they saie they doe; since the worde of life it selfe, that mouth which neuer spake guile hath said, *He that eateth my flesh, & drinketh my blood, hath eternall life, & I will raise him vp at the last daie: And hee that eateth my flesh and drinketh my blood, dwelleth in me & I in him*? And by the third waie described, that those eate him *sacramentally*, & *spiritually*, who doe duly prepare themselues, & puting on the wedding garmēt, doe come vnto that holy table, doth breed an other scruple

Cap. 8. de vsu admirabilis huius sacramenti
1. Sacramentally.
2. Spiritually, who cannot for the time communicate.
3. Sacramentally & spiritually who doe cō municate as they ought.
Ioh 6. 54. 56.
Sacramentally & Spiritually so say the Protestants

Really & substantially may stād to gether but spiritually cannot

how *sacramentally* can stand with spiritually, vnderstanding by sacramentally, as they did before really, fleshly & substātially, those two tearmes being also vsed of the Protestants, who say the wicked doe eate sacramētally only, that is the sacrament of his body and bloud, & the godly sacramentally & spiritually, that is bread and wine with the hand & mouth & the body & blood by faith, and noe otherwise, which are the right vse of the words *sacramentally & spiritually*; Againe, I may demand of them, why they doe not describe the presence of Christ to be *spiritual* & *sacramental*, aswel as describe him so to be eaten? they saie he is eaten by on of those three waies of al men in generall *good* & *bad*: and to al men good & bad they describe him presēt really, truly & substantially body & soule diuinitie and al, & yet eaten only *sacramentally* & *spiritually*: now it is not possible to be thought, but that the *Spirituall eating of Christ in the sacrament excludeth the corporall*; as his spiritual presence wil his corporall or substantiall, nether can noe one meat be fit both for the body and soule, as al men knowe; And therfore if they will dissent from vs & not from themselues also, they must dispute either of a corporall eating of the flesh of Christ, or of a spiritual only (as *Genebrard* confesseth was brought in about *Bertrams* time of most 800. yeares since) & not to a corporall to adde a spiritual, of one & the same thinge; nor confound the tearmes of *sacramentall, Spirituall*, & *reall*. Againe (it is alwaies seene, one absurditie draweth on an other) I demand how their tearme of *receauing spiritually* doth agree with *Bellarmine* whoe saith that the body of Christ is verily & properly eaten in the Eucharist by our body, & sent frō the mouth into the stomake; that the body of Christ entreth in at the mouth of the communicants, and is verily receaued by the mouth of the body; small spirituall receauing is there by the instruments of the mouth & belly; Faith must haue other food; if it were so, it should not be said *Crede & manducasti*, beleiue & thou hast eaten: but lay hold with thy hand, & thou art safe.

De manducatione corporis domini, sit nē illa vera, antropica, sensibilis an insensibilis, modo corporeo an spirituali. l. 4. chron. fol. 790

Fallacia alia a liā trudit. Ter. in And. act. 4. scen. 4.

De sac. euc. l. 1 c. 11. fol. 92. c. 14. fol. 117. & l. 2. c. 8. fol. 163

The

The next in authoritie to the Trent Fathers is the Romish Cathechisme, gathered by their decree, & published by *Pius quintus* the Pope. The catechisme intreating of that article of our beleife *He ascended into heauen, and sitteth one the right hand of god the father almightie*, doe say the right sense of that article is, that the faithful without all doubt ought to beleiue, that Christ, the mysterie of our redemption being perfected and finished, *vt homo est, in cœlum corpore & animâ ascendisse*, as he is man; is ascended in body and soule into heauen. For as hee is God hee was neuer from thence, filling all places with his diuinitie. And speaking of the causes whie Christ our sauiour would ascend vp into heauen, one is because by ascending (say they) hee would bringe to passe *that wee should mount vp thither in minde and affection*: and amongst many benefits which come vnto men by his ascention into heauen, they reckon this a great one *quod amorem nostrum ad cœlum rapuit ac diuino spiritu inflammauit*, that it draweth our mindes and loue to heauen, & inflameth them with a diuine spirit, for it is truly said, *There our harte is*, where our treasure is, & surly if Christ our Lord *were conuersant* in earth *omnis nostra cogitatio in ipso hominis aspectu & consuetudine defixa esset* all our cogitations, would be placed in the looking & maner of him, & we shold behold him only as man, becaus he had don so great things for vs; But ascending into heauen, it maketh our loue heauenly, and causeth that whom wee think of being absent, him we worship and loue as God; which doctrine of theirs being very sound and Catholike cannot chuse but ouerthrowe their owne opinion of Transubstantiatiō, which bringeth the same body of Christ; that same that was borne of the Virgin & which is ascended, and sitteth now (& euer shal) at the right hand of his father in heauen, to bee transubstantiated into bread, & to bee contained in the sacrament, & this to be done without mutation or change of place, or any strange creation, which they doe so much abiure. If since the mysterie of our redemption wrought and finished, Christ

Catec. Rom. pt 1. art. 6. c. 7. fol 57.

The right sēce of the article, ouerthroweth Transubstantiation.

Vt qui diuinitate, iua loca omnia cōpleat

The causes why hee ascēded. ib. fol. 59.

The benefits of his ascention. ibid. fol. 61

Marc. 6.

Catec. p. 2. c. 4. fol. 181.

Ibid. fol. 187.

as man bee aſcended into heauen, and thither in ſoule and minde we ought to mount and goe after, and that it be good for vs that he aſcended, and bee there; as agreeing to the ſcripture which ſaith *ſeek thoſe things which are aboue, where Chriſt ſitteth one the right hand of his father* they doe teach; Is it not earthly and groſſe to ſeeke him in the earth, and ſubſtantially and fleſhly to haue him? And is it not a great hinderance to the ſpirits of our minds, and bringeth it vs not into earthly cogitations which are euer to be ſhunned? If they ſay true in the one aſſertion, they erre in the other, for both cannot be true. At one & the ſame time, they make the ſame Chriſt ſitting in heauen at the right hand of his father according to the dimenſions, parts, and proportions of a true body, & the ſame Chriſt at the ſame time in the ſacrament without dimẽſions, parts, or proportions of a true bodie, which is wholy to ouerthrow the truth of his body, and vtterly to diſanull our beleife therof, a part wherof is, that he is in heauẽ with thoſe dimenſions, and diſtinction of parts wherwith hee liued on earth, and wherwith he was crucified, and ſo died, was buried and aſcended.

(Omnis contradictio eſt eadem.

The Rhemiſts in their teſtament followe the ſame ſtepps. They ſay it is plaine by the ſcripture, that *the bleſſed chalice of the aultar* (at their Maſſe) hath the verie ſacrifical blood in it that was ſhed vpon the Croſſe: the like they affirme in other places of the body. Now as the Trent fathers Catechiſme, & Rhemiſts, are found to ſpeake impieties and contradictions in this firſt queſtion of the preſence of Chriſt in the Euchariſts vſing ſome tearmes, as may be eaſily yeilded vnto, as before is ſhewed; And ſome others which repunge their owne grounds, and be altogether different from them; ſo before I goe to others of them, I wil ſhew how theſe goe about (& indeed it is about) to make their Maſſe a ſacrifice, that is to ſay to offer the reall, fleſhly, & ſubſtantial body of Chriſt to god his father; the ſame which he offered on the Croſſe for the ſinnes of the world. They cannot tell in this what tearmes to

Rhem. Heb. 9. v. 20. & 10. v. 11

12.
1. Really
2. Subſtãtially
3. Sacramẽtally
4. Spiritually.

Of the Sacrifice of the Maſſe.

vſe

vse but veile their meanings with such words that further eth neither their cause, nor hindreth ours. The counsell pretendeth to intreat of the sacrifice of the Masse *quatenus verum & singulare sacrificium est*: so far forth as it is *a true and soueraigne sacrifice*; Christ therfore our Lord although hee was to offer himselfe once on the aultar of the Crosse, & that with death to work there our eternall redemptiō, yet becausse the preisthood by his death was not to be extinguished, he did leaue to the Church his most beloued spouse, at his last supper the verie night hee was betrayed *a visible sacrifice*, wher in that bloody sacrifice, which was to bee donne but once on the Crosse, might bee *represented*, and that the memory of him should be continued to the worlds ende; and therfore he being a Preist after the order of *Melchisedech*, offered his body and blood, vnder the formes of bread and wine, to God his Father. And further they saie, becausse in this holy sacrifice which is performed in the Masse *idem ille Christus continetur & incruentè immolatur*, the same Christ is contained, *& offered vnbloodily*, whoe did offer himselfe once one the aulter of the Crosse *bloodily*, the holy synode teacheth that this sacrifice is *trulie propitious*, & that whosoeuer shal say that in the Masse is not offered to God *verum & proprium sacrificium* a true and proper sacrifice, let him be accursed.

Conc. Trid. sess. 22. in præf. de sac. missæ. On the Crosse on sacrifice that was bloody. Cap. 1.

Cap. 2. The sāe Christ offered vnbloodily. A propiriatory sacrifice. Can. 1.

So by the Trent Fathers we must beleiue the Masse to be *a true soueraigne & propitiatory sacrifice, & the same which Christ offered on the Crosse*. But marke their tearmes; In the sacrifice of their Masse is *represented* the sacrifice of Christ on the Crosse & there is he offered *vnbloodily*; these tearmes they shal haue of vs; we say the Lords supper *is* a sacrifice, as it is the passiō of Christ, that is, a thankful remembrance of Christs passiō, and that Christs blood is shed in *a mysterie*. But with them, how is Christs sacrifice *represented*, if the same Christ be *really offered*, who offered himselfe on the Crosse? What need the same thing to be a remembrance of it selfe, and in the one to offer himselfe *painfully & bloodily*, and in the other same sacrifice,

fice to be offered *neither painfullie nor bloodily* If hee be offered but *vnbloodily* in the Maſſe, how ſaie the Rhemiſts *that the very blood which* Chriſt ſhed on the aultar of the croſſe is in the Challice, at the time of the Maſſe? Or D. *Allen* that there ia a *reall offering* of the body of Chriſt, as there is a real preſence; ſo that I ſee not, if they meane as they ſpeake, whie they mince the word *vnbloodily* as they doe. Would they ſay that blood is ſhed? let it be ſhed; let not blood be ſhed *vnbloodily*, they knowe not how.

If the trent Fathers & Rhemiſts, by their tearme *vnbloodily* doe meane *myſticallie*, as they ſaie in an other place, wee agree with them they ſhal haue vs reaſonable. It is ſhed in a myſterie, not executed indeed, and that is rightly tearmed a myſterie; & not as they ſaie in a myſterie, that is *really*: Or he is now *immolated* or offered (as they are driuen to ſaie) *in a ſacrament*, which wee ſaie alſo; but not in *a ſacrament*, that is really and ſubſtantially; *Omne enigmaticum, omne offuſum caligine loquendi*. Al this is darke & couered with miſts. D. *Allen* til ouerthroweth himſelfe and them too; for hee ſaith againe, that in their Maſſe there is *onlie a ſacramentall killing or ſheding of blood*; which we alſo wil neuer denie; for in the Lords ſupper we haue the death of Chriſt in a myſterie, in a figure, or ſacrament. Chriſt is there killed *ſacramentally*, for there we ſee the death of the ſonne of God, there wee ſee that hee tooke our heauineſſe, and bare our ſorrowes, was wounded for our offences, and was rent and tormented for our wickednes, and in this reſpect the miniſtration of the holie communion is of the learned fathers called *a ſacrifice*, becauſe therin wee offer vp vnto God the father thankes & praiſe, for that great ſacrifice once made vpon the Croſſe. But for the ſame ſacrifice that Chriſt offered with blood, that ſame to be offered daily in the maſſe without blood, or how blood ſhoulde bee ſhed there vnbloodily as they inferre, noe age of the Church neuer yet knewe, ſince Chriſts time, but the petite deuiſers of late:

Saint

Nec cruentè nec penali modo allē de euc. ſac. l. 2. c 10, fol. 541

Rhem. annot. heb. 9. v. 20. The very blud in the Chalice

Allen de ſac. euch. l. 2. c. 11. realis immola

annot. 9. 1. v. 25: Chriſt offered vnbloodily.

Rhe. Mat. 26. v. 28. 2. myſtically.

3. In a ſacrament annot. Luc. 22. 19. fol. 205.

camp. 2. rat. Sacramentalis mactatio c. 14. ſine how agreeth it with a reall offering and reall preſence.

Saint *Auguſtine* that ancient learned Father could in few and plaine words deſcribe vnto vs the perfect ſignification of the ſacrifices of the old law, & of our ſacrament now, and what relation they both haue to the ſacrifice of Chriſt, without any ſuch obſcure or obtuſe tearmes as theſe men vſe. *Hujus ſacrificij caro & ſanguis ante aduentum Chriſti per victimas ſimilitudinum promittebatur.* The fleſh & blood of this ſacrifice before the comming of Chriſt was promiſed by ſacrifices of Reſemblance, the ſame was performed indeed in the time of Chriſts paſſion, *poſt aſcenſionem Chriſti per ſacramentum memoriæ celebratur*, but after Chriſts aſcenſion, it is frequented by a *ſacrament of remembrance*. And to this of *Auguſtine* they ſhal haue the whol Church of England ſubſcribe, & therfore let them take home the ſlaunder they lay vpon vs, in that wee vſe *circular turnings or windings*, in our diſputs and aunſweres with them. That the Rhemiſts are as dark and obſcure as any other of them in this queſtion, it wil appeare to any that will read their notes, which more at large I will nowe ſhewe. As Chriſt neuer died but once, nor neuer ſhal die againe, ſo in that violent, painfull, and bloody ſort, hee cannot be offered againe, nether needeth he ſo to be offered any more, *hauing by that one action of ſacrifice vpon the Croſſe made the full ranſome, redemption, & remedie for the ſinns of the whol world.* Nethertheleſſe as Chriſt died and was offered after a ſort in all the ſacrifices of the law & nature, ſince the beginning of the world, al which were figures of this one oblation vppon the Croſſe, ſo he is much rather offered in the ſacrifice of the altar of the new Teſtament incomparably more neere, diuinly & truly expreſſing his death, his body broken, his blood ſhed, then any figure of the old law, or other ſacrifice that euer was, as being indeed (though in hidden ſacrament all and miſticall and vnbloody maner) *the very ſelfe ſame bleſſed body & blood*, the ſelfe ſame hoſt, oblation & ſacrifice that was don vpon the croſſe. Againe they ſaie, noe one of the ſacrifices; nor al the ſacrifices of the old law, could make that one ge-

Tom. 6. contra Fauſtũ Mani. l. 20. c. 21. fine. Camp. rat. 9. de Sophiſ. ecclum quos gyros, quas rotas fabricat Rhem. Annot. heb. 9. v. 25. Marke S. Aug. words before he vſeth none of theſe oppoſite ill fauoured tearmes to expreſſe the ſacrifice of the Church after his aſcention his ſacrifice on the Croſſe is frequented by a ſacramẽt of remembrãce ſaith he. Præter hoc igitur & ante hoc ſacrificiũ mortis, aliud pridie inſtituit & fecit ipſe idq; nec cruẽtè, nec pœnali modo. Allen l. 2. c. 10. fol. 541 Rhem. annot. heb. 9. v. 12.

nerall price, ransome & redemption of al mankind and of al sinns, saving this one highest Preist Christ, and the one sacrifice of his blood once offered vpon the Crosse, *which sacrifice of redemption cannot be often done, because Christ could not die but once*, though the figures also therof in the law of nature & of *Moses* were truly called sacrifices, as especially this hie and marueilous *commemoration of the same* in the holy sacrament of the aultar, according to the rite of the newe Testament is most *truly* and singularly (as S. *Augustine* saith) a sacrifice. But neither this *sort*, nor the other of the old law, being often repeated and done by many Preists could bee the generall redeeming & consummating sacrifice &c.

One only sacrifice on the crosse the redeption of the world, and on only preist Christ the redeemer therof. The Masse a commemoratiō of Christs sacrifice. This sort.

You would thinke that in these two verses of their annotations, they had handled that text as though they had met, that Christ dying but once, had need neuer to haue died againe. Noe more shal he saie they; for in that violent, painful and bloody sort (as hee died on the crosse) he can neuer bee offered againe; here they exclude his dying againe, or often; but not his offering againe, or often: It is maruaile they did not deuise how he might die againe, so it were not in that *violent, painfull, & bloody sort* as his death was on the crosse; as wel as deuise such an offering, as shalbe neither *violent, painfull*, nor *bloody*: so where they should lay their reasōs, to proue either a *reall offering* or not; *a reall dying* or not, they leaue it in the halfe & come in with *manners* & *respects*, altering cleane the nature of the thinge. For nether coulde Christ himselfe (much lesse any mortal man) offer himselfe often without dying often, as is most plaine by the Apostle in the 4 last verses of that 9. chapter, so their fumbling here, is with as ill successe as D. *Allens* before cited, whoe maketh *a reall offering* (which they stick at, vnlesse they will haue it neither *violent, painfull, nor bloody*, and then wherin is it *reall*) & *a sacrament all shedding of blood*. Againe they saie that that one action on the Crosse made the full ransome for the sinns of the world; what need any more sacrifice for sinns then, as their is? But being

the

the ſame that his was, whie doth it not redeeme as his did, *euen as a generall price & ranſome*, or let them ſhew wherin the defect is, that *being the ſame Chriſt*, it ſhould not haue the ſame effect? Chriſt ſaith S. *Paule* after hee had offered one ſacrifice for ſinne, ſitteth for euer at the right hand of God. Heb. 10.12

Furthermore, that *reall immolation* which D. *Allen* ſpeaketh of, ſoundeth more then this *hidden, ſacramentall, & myſtical offering or immolation*, which they ſpeak of here, otherwiſe they maie ſpeake of a *reall* betraying, *a reall crucifying, a real ſheding of his blood, & powring out of it on the ground now*, & then qualify them with *a hidden, ſacramentall, and miſticall maner*. But what cauſed them in this 12. verſe as before ſet downe, to cal their Maſſe *a commemoration* of Chriſts ſacrifice, & when they haue ſpoken of the Iewes ſacrifices, & of Chriſts, to cal their maſſe by an other name *This ſort*? Doe they take their maſſe to bee a different ſacrifice from that of the croſſe? *a commemoration* of it, as they call it, & not the *ſame, but* of an other *ſort*? D. *Allen* hath manifeſt words to that purpoſe, making that which Chriſt did at his laſt ſupper, and that of the maſſe now, to be of an other *ſort*, & of a different *kinde* from that of the *Croſſe*; For aunſwering to our obiections, that the ſame exceptions which ſerue S. *Paul* to the Hebrews, againſt the Iewiſh ſacrifices, wil alſo ſerue againſt their ſacrifice of the maſſe, ſaith, It is to be noted, that it cannot be denied, that the ſame oppoſition maie be almoſt ſet betweene the *oblation* of the *ſupper*, & the *oblation of the Croſſe*, ſince it is certaine *they are of a diuers ſort*, the one being *an abſolute*, & *indepēdēt ſacrifice*, the other *commemoratiue*, & *ſignificatiue*, as were the Iewiſh ſacrifices; So againe ſaith he, if any chriſtian ſhould bee in ſuch an error, as to thinke that the ſacrifice of the *Maſſe* were an *abſolute* & *independent ſacrifice*, & that it need not to bee referred to the fountaine of al ſacrifices *the death of Chriſt*, hee might be almoſt confuted by the ſame argumeuts of S. *Paule*, howſoeuer ours doe far exceed theirs. This is plaine both againſt that of the ſupper, and theirs in the Maſſe; nether muſt the

But neither this ſort nor the other of the law. &c.

Cap. 8. 9. & 10. Allen de euch. ſacrif. l. 2. c. 23. fol. 594. 596. Illa eſſe diuerſi generis.

The oblation of him in the ſupper, & ours in the Maſſe is but one oblation, the ſame ſacrifice. Hard art. 17. f 206. b

The fountaine referred to the fountaine: or the ſame to the ſame.

Annot. Heb. 10 v. 11. Rhemists any more inculcate that *they offer the very selfe same body in number, euen Christs owne body that was crucified*, except they wil make Christ inferiour to himselfe.

Locor theol. l. 11. fol 427. a. The Next vnto these before, which I meane to bringe in, is *Melchior Canus*, a great scholler, and an acute disputant; He reproueth vs mightily, because we gather *si eucharistia exemplar & imago est, non esse illam verè & propriè sacrificium*, That if the Eucharist be a samplar, and image, it cannot properly & truly be a sacrifice; the collection, saith he, is very ridiculous; for what can be more foolish then to say that the *hosts* of the old law were not sacrifices, because they were *samplers of the true*? And thervpon he telleth vs, that *Innocentius* the 3. Pope of that name doth laugh at vs for such inferēces. First touching *Innocentius*, his authoritie cannot be much in this case, because we knowe not that his definitiue sentence passed out of his chaire against vs in this point; but only that he so wrot as a priuate man: because *Canus* himselfe telleth vs that *Innocentius* the 4. did make commentaries vpon the books called *Decretalls*, & if in them he wrot an error, it is to bee imputed vnto him that he *erred* as a *man*, & not as a *Pope*. And D. *Harding* by name refuseth this same *Innocentius* 3, in the matter of al waighty matters the waightiest, euen in the question of *Consecration*, when it should be done, saying, what if *Scotus* & *Innocentius tertius* doe thinke consecration to be done, *by other then our Lords* wordes, is not the catholike church agreed herein? Thus we see a good matter if we wil; the catholike church maie be resolued without the Pope; in any point I hope aswell as in *Consecration*: and therfore I hope they will not presse the Popes authoritie, though hee bee against vs in this, to haue the Eucharist the *image* & the thing, & so make one thing, both *an image* and the truth. Indeed wee say with S. *Augustine*, If sacraments had not a likenesse and similitude of the things whereof they are sacraments, properly and rightly, they should not be called sacraments; But if any thing become the same, it hath not any likenesse to it any more, but

L. 6. c. 8. f. 205.

Reioynder. fo 70.

The Catholik church maie bee resolued, with the Pope a good hearing.

Epist. 23. ad. Bonif. Epis.

pas-

passeth wholy into that wherof it shoulde bee a likenesse: as saith S. *Cyprian.*

Alioquin si eadem essent omnia, iam non exemplaria dicerentur, sed ipsę potius res de quibus agitur viderentur Cyp. in. Symb.

To come to the argument which he saith is *foolishly* gathered, wil it pleaset their wisdomes aswel to hear what fooles can saie further in defence of their *folly*, as to controule without cause what they haue wel said; we tel him that his example from the Iewish sacrifice cōmeth not neere, where he would haue it reach: For wil hee compare his sacrifice in this point, with those of the law? Theirs of the law did prefigure Christs sacrifice, & were true sacrifices in that kinde, because they were truly and really done vpon slaine beastes, whose blood was shed. But were they so far forth *true sacrifices*, that they were the same too, vnto which they had relation? Did the Preists in the law offer the same body, that Christ offered, as they say they doe in their Masse? If they did not, then for those to be granted to bee *verie true sacrifices* wil profit him nothing at al for his. The Iewish sacrifices were also samplers for the *perfect & absolute sacrifice*, was not thē comes but wherof should their Masse bee a sampler or remembrance, since they sacrifice Christ present; for that which is sacrificed must be present, that which is represēted and remembred is absēt: Christs bodie being therfore represented in the Eucharist, cannot bee then and there really offered. And by this aunswere also the Rhemists are discharged whoe borrow *Canus* his argument, who say that this Masse of theirs is noe lesse a true sacrifice, because it is commemoratiue of Christs passion. then those of the olde testament were the lesse true, because they were prefiguratiue of the same. For those sacrifices were not the same sacrifice, or thing wherof they were prefiguratiue, noe more can their Masse being commemoratiue (and though it were a sacrifice as they would haue it) it could not bee the same thing, wherof it is commemoratiue.

Luc. for a commemoration. cap. 22. v. 19.

But come to *Canus*, as to the rest for the manner of offering, hee goeth backe *to a mystery* and to *a figure*. In the Crosse (saith he) it is plaine the host was bloody, and done without

In altari occultè & mysticè obscondita.

mysterie; but in the aultar it is hid darkly & *mystically*, yet the same host is on the Crosse & on the Aultar: On the Crosse suffering, on the aultar hid in a mysterie Hee concludeth in the sacrifice of the Eucharist Christ is offered *mystically*, & *unbloodily*, & therfore there is an *host*, where in other sacraments there is none. I speake properly, saith hee, for by a kinde of speech *Baptisme* also is somtime called *an host*. And who euer called the Eucharist a sacrifice *properly*, as the nature of the word foundeth? or said it was the *thinge it selfe*, & not a *figure sampler* & *similitude*, since *Gregorie Nazianzene*, as *D. Tonstall* quoteth him vnto vs, speaking of things done in the old law *The arke*, or *the Paschall Lamb*, saith *Paschа legale, audenter dico, figure a figura erat obscurior*, the Easter Lamb in the law. I speak boldly was an obscure figure of a figure, that is a figure of the Eucharist. So that touching any substance of matter, the Eucharist is noe more the *body*, then the *sacrifices* & *sacramēts* in the law; all, both theirs & ours being referred to Christ on the Crosse. To proceed to the obiection made out of Saint *Paule Heb. 9. 16. 25.* That the host which is sacrificed by offering must of necessity be reall offered and slaine, if then in euerie of their Masses Christ be offered in sacrifice, in euerie of their Masses he is also slaine; therfore ether S. *Paules* argument it frustrat where he saith *Otherwise he ought to suffer ofte from the beginning of the world*; or if Christ be offered in sacrifice he dieth verily and indeed: but they al confesse they offer Christs liuing body & impassible; so at the most they find an oblation, they cannot finde a sacrifice. To this obiection he scoffingly saith, that wee haue found out wherwith to maintaine our counterfeit opinion; but hee cannot finde how to ouerthrow so weake an argumēt. We wil grant (saith hee) to those that argue against vs, that *to the perfect offering of the creature, there must be the death and end of it*, if it bee *truly sacrificed*. But we offer not *a liuely* ond *breathing bodie*; such a bodie is in the Eucharist & in heauen; yet although the body of Christ in the Eucharist be a liuing body, & the blood bee in the bo-

Ibid. fol. 436. b

Ibid fol. 438. b

In sanctū pasc l. 2. fol 66.

Figura figuræ.

Canus ibid. ob. fol. 404. ex Cal uin. Instit. l. 4. c. 18. par. 5. f. 475

Canus ibid. fo 421. hee doth well to set the obiection and answere so far a sunder.

At corpus viuū & spirans non offerimus idē enim in Eucharistia est at o: in cœlo.

dy

dy, yet wee doe nether offer the body, because it is aliue, or the blood because it is in the body; but the body in regard it is slaine, the blood because it was shed on the Crosse.

Thus by this answer of his, wher before the distinctiō stood with them of offering the same body which was offered on the crosse, (and that that body was in the Eucharist) but after an other manner, then on the Crosse, *vnbloodily*, or in a *mystery* now he confesseth they offer not *a liuing body* but because it is *slaine*; then there must needs followe death, nor the blood as it is in the *body*, but because it was shed on the crosse, whie then are they afraid to call their sacrifice *bloody*, but vnbloody, if the host be slaine? and this argumēt of *Canus* haue the Rhemists borowed as they did the former, for in their first conflict about this sacrament they professe *That they consecrate the seuerall elements, not into Christs whole person as it was borne of the Virgin or is now in heauen, but the bread into his body a part, as betrayed, broken and giuē for vs, the wine into his blood apart, as shed out of his body for remission of sinnes, in which mysticall and vnspeakable manner he would haue the Church to offer and sacrifice him daily*, & he in mistery & sacrament dieth, though *now not only in heauen, but also in the sacrament he bee indeed (by sequel of al his parts to each other) whole, aliue, & immortall.*

Rhem. 26. mat. v. 26. shew the sence or meāing of this note in anie writer ancient & take the whole.

Dieth in a sacrament, & is presēt indeed.

Thus monstrously doe they teach, now they thinke, they haue gotten a sacrifice into their hands, But how they offer, wirhout blood or with blood, whether aliue or dead; whether the same that Christ did, either at his supper, or on the Crosse, that they cannot tel, nor with any wordes explaine! Their descriptions in these, are like that of *Syrus* in the Poet, when he sent one brother to finde an other, but by the derection taken, he neuer knewe where to finde him. *Praeterito hāc rectâ plateâ sursum, vbi eo veneris, aliuus deorsum, vorsum est.* Passe right through this street to the ouer part, when you come there, there is a steepe place towards the lower ende therof, run downe this way; after that there is on this hand a Chappell, and there fast by in a narrow corner. A speech ful

Teren. in adel. act. 4. Scen. 2.

Perplexa descriptio

of

of perplexitie. That they ſhould violate or alter the holy ordinance of God touching Chriſts ſacrifice which was as they ſay themſelues *violent, painfull, & bloody* into a ſacrifice reall, true, yea and propitiatory, which ſhall bee neither violent, painfull, nor bloody, and yet ſacrifice his body, as betraied, broken & giuen for vs, & the blood as ſhed out of his body, & that very blood which was in the vaines of his body, and yet for him to *die in a myſtery, & to ſuffer in ſacrament, & all to bee done vnbloodily*, & ſo change the nature & ſubſtance of that ſacrifice which was the purchaſe & redemption of the whole world, as it is blaſphemous for them to teach; ſo haue they brought ſuch phraſes and words as none can vnderſtand, vpheld by none but themſelues. God neuer intended that his ſonne ſhould offer himſelfe anie more but once, and that was with ſhedding of blood & death, & ſo muſt hee be offered, or not at all offered. if we will ſpeake of a reall offering and a real ſacrifice, a reall preſence, and a reall offering, & a real death cā not be ſeuered.

The ſacrifice of Chriſt on the Croſſe.

The ſacrifice of their Maſſe.

Read 7.8.9.10 cap. to the Hebrewes.

If the anciēt Church of God had deliuered their doctrine & opinions, in ſuch confuſed tearmes as theſe men doe, wee had bin as much to ſeeke what had bin their minides in this caſe, as wee are of theſe men nowe; But they were expedite & cleare, as by their diſcourſes appeareth. *Nonne ſemel immolatus eſt Chriſtus in ſeipſo?* Was not Chriſt (ſaith S. *Auguſtine*) once offered in himſelfe? And yet in a ſacrament hee is offered for the benefite of the people, not euery Eaſter only, but euery day; Neither doth hee lie when the queſtion is aſked, and anſwereth Chriſt is offered daily vnto the people. For if ſacramēts had not a certaine reſemblitude of the things whereof they be ſacraments, they ſhould bee no ſacraments at al; *ex hac autem ſimilitudine plerumq; etiam ipſarum rerum nomina accipiunt.* And by reaſon of this ſimilitude, they vſually take the names of the things themſelues. This is without glose or ambiguitie. Chriſt (ſaith S. *Auguſtine*) was once offered in himſelfe, And is offered daily in a ſacrament: & for that the

Aug. Epiſt. 23. ſere finē. Chriſt is nowe offered not in ſubſtance, but in a ſacrament or repreſentatiō of his death D. Allen is out with his owne Catholikes, becauſe they cā not bring this place of Aug: handſomly to ſerue their turne. de fac. Euch. l. 2. ca. 11

ſpeech

ſpeech ſhould be vnderſtood, how *once* & how *daily*, it is added in a *ſacrament*, and in *himſelfe*. And why, when it is done now but in a ſacrament, may it yet be truly ſaid *Chriſt is offered*? becauſe ſacraments haue the names of the thinges themſelues, for a certaine reſemblance that is betweene thē. This doth the words immediatly following ſhew. *Sicut ergo ſecundum quendam modum*, Therfore after a certaine manner of ſpeech *the ſacrament of Chriſts body, is Chriſts body, & the ſacrament of Chriſts blood, is Chriſts blood, & the ſacrament of faith is faith.* & this he illuſtrateth after by the ſacramēt of Baptiſme out of S. *Paule*, whoe ſaith by Baptiſme wee bee buried with Chriſt into death, he ſaith not we ſignifie buriall, but he ſaith plainly wee bee buried: ſo that the ſacrament of ſo great a thinge, is not called but by the name of the thing it ſelf. Thus far *Auguſtine*, S. *Cyprian* was before S. *Auguſtine* certaine hūdreds of yeares; hee telleth vs without any ſcruple, ot bone caſt in of doubt, both what Chriſt did at his laſt ſupper and what on the croſſe, in ſound words & few: *Dedit dominus noſter in menſa*. Our Lord at the table wherat hee receaued his laſt ſupper with his diſciples, with his own hands gaue bread & wine; But vpon the croſſe, he gaue his own body with the ſouldiers hands to be wounded. This is by S. *Cyprian* the ſacrifice of the table, & the ſacrifice of the croſſe; at the one he gaue bread & wine; vpon the other he gaue his body; Here is noe vailing of him vnder formes and ſhewes of bread and wine, noſpeaking of quantities & qualities without ſubſtāce, nor offering vp of him to God his father. In an other place he ſaith in moſt plaine words. *Nec ſacerdotij eius pœnituit deū* It neuer repented God (ſaith he) of Chriſts preiſthood; For the ſacrifice that he offered vpō the croſſe, is ſo acceptable in the goodwil of God, & ſo ſtandeth in continuall ſtrength & virtue, that the ſame oblatiō is noe leſſe acceptable this day in the ſight of God the Father, then it was that daie when blood & water ranne out of his wonnded ſide, *& ſemper reſeruata in corpore plagæ ſalutis humanæ exigant pretium & obedien-*

Rom. 6.

Cip. tom. 2. de vnct. chr. is mat. fere fine.

Tom. 2. de bap tiſm. Chriſti & manif. trinit. fine.

tie donatiuum requirant. And the skarrs reserued still in his body doe suffice for the redemption of man and doe require a fauour because of the obedience. This is plaine according to the scriptures, that once Preist, by one sacrifice once offered, that is our sauiour by giuing himselfe to death vpō the Crosse hath reconciled vs to God, & sanctified vs for euer, & cuteth of their many Preists, to offer oftē, as though there were left now after the death of Christ *an offering for sin*, or his pretious blood were of noe greater value then the blood of Bulls & Goates which were offered often, because they coulde not purge sinne.

Heb. 7. 23. 27. & 10. v. 12. & 9 v. 28.

There is a Master amongst them called the Master of the sentēces, *P. Lumbard.* or *Longobardus* (who collected a breife of doctrine out of the Greeke & latine Fathers) ancienter by far then the counsel of Trent, *Allen*, *Canus*, or the *Rhemists*, and before any Protestant (if they saie true that are accustomed to lie) who liued in the yeare of our Lord Bishop of Paris anno, 1160. vpon whose bookes, suruey hath bin made, & although they haue gathered noe Index vpon him, as they haue done vpon others, yet they haue noted him in manie places where they mislike him with a *non tenetur, the master is not allowed here*. This Catholike Doctor much renowned amongst them taught euen as the Protestāts doe, *in this quaestiō of the sacrifice of Christ in the Masse*, & yet hath escaped frō amongst them, without so much as an *item for it*, which manifestly sheweth that though they haue vs offenders in that matter they haue their cheife Master also a ringleader therin & themselues or brethrē accessary therto, because they haue not taxed him therfore. And howsoeuer we maie be faultie, (the case standing as it doth) our aunswere is the same with the womans in the poet *Nam si ego digna hac contumelia sum maximè, at tu indignus qui faceres tamen.* For although I be neuer so wel worthy to be so spitfully handled, yet were you no meete man to doe it (saith shee) And as *Medea* saith to *Iasō*

Vide Genebr. Chron. l. 4. an. 1159. fol. 932.

Paris.

Magister hic non tenetur.

Terenc. in Eunuch. act 5. scen. 2.

Senec. in Medea, act 3.

Omnes coniugem infamem arguant, solus tuere, solus insontem voca.

Tibi.

Tibi innocens sit, quisquis est pro te nocens. Let others defame me with infamie, yet doe thou only take my part; doe thou call me iust & vndefiled, let him be an innocent to thee, who for thee doth transgresse. The words of *Lumbard* are these, *Post hæc quæritur, si quod gerit sacerdos proprie dicatur sacrificium, vel immolatio, & si Christus quotidie immolatur, vel semel tantum immolatus sit.* I demand (saith he) whether that which the preist doth be properly called a sacrifice, & an oblation or not; and whether Christ bee daily offered, or else were offered only once. To this (saith he) our answere in breif is, that that which is offered, & consecrated by the Preist, is called a sacrifice & oblation, *because it is a memory & representation of the true sacrifice, & holy oblation which was made on the aultar of the crosse. Et semel Christus mortuus in cruce est, ibiq; immolatus est in semetipso* Christ also died once on the Crosse, & there was he offered himselfe, *quotidie autem immolatur in sacramento*, but hee is offered daily in a sacrament, because in the sacrament there is a remembrance of that which was once don on the Crosse. And this is not Peter *Lumbardes* opinion only, but his strong proofe & collection out of all the Fathers *Greeke and Latine*, noe one of thē euer dreaming of sacrificing the sonne of God to his father, or of making the same *sacrifice vnbloody*, which Christ made *bloody*, or to haue the sacrament, both the thing itselfe, and a remembrance of it selfe, & al at one time.

Sent l. 4. dist. 12 parag. 7. Christ is not now really offered, but the memorie of his sacrifice is celebrated.

Wherfore although the sacrifice be a true, & proper, & soueraigne propitiatorie sacrifice, as it is defined by the Trent Fathers, yet that sacrifice which the ancient Church of God 1400. yeares before those of Trent spake of, was not so called *properly*, & according to the rigor of the word: with them the celebration of the Lordes supper is called *an oblation*, for that it is a representatiō of Christs death, & sacraments haue names of the things which they signifie, & because the merits & fruits of Christs passion are by the power of his spirit devided & bestowed on the faithful receauers of these mysteries. Thomas of Aquine was in his time of greater credit

with them then the Master of the sentences, though in time later, the Master is not euer allowed by them, but Thomas, they saie hath done *all things acutly & well*: & yet hee saith as we say in this. In two respects (saith hee) *celebratio huius sacramenti dicitur immolatio Christi*; the celebratiō of this sacramēt may be called the sacrificing of Christ; First becausse as S. *Augustine* saith resemblances are wont to be called by the name of those things, wherof they are resemblances & therfore the celebration of this sacrament is a certaine representatiue Image of the passion of Christ, which is his true sacrificing; Secondly touching the effect of Christs passion, *quia scilicet per hoc sacramentum participes efficimur fructus dominicæ passionis*, because by this sacrament wee are made partakers of the fruite of the Lords passiō. This of Thomas wereceaue against their reall, external, & corporal kinde of offering the liue flesh of Christ to God the Father by the Preists handes vnder the formes of bread & wine, as now they teach they doe. With what facilitie of language D. *Harding* & D. *Stephan Gardiner* proceeded in this question I will now also shew you: and the rather becausse *Campian*, & *Durens* both, doe highly commēd *D. Harding* & his worke; he hauing spoken something of the sacrifice of Christ on the Crosse, done with *shedding of blood* in his owne person, as the scripture witnesseth; commeth to shew how he is handled in their Masse, saith; Sacramentally or in a mysterie Christ is offered vp to his Father in the daily sacrifice of the Church, vnder the forme of bread and wine, *truly, & indeed, not in respect of the maner of offering, but in respect of his very body & blood really present*. And after recitinge the words of the Evangelists (*how that Christ at his last supper took bread gaue thankes brake it, & said take eate this is my body which is giuen for you, and this is my blood which is shed for you in remission of sinnes*) out of which he would proue his sacrifice, saith they are wordes of sacrificing & offering, they shew and set forth an oblation in *act & deed*, though the tearme it selfe of *oblatiō* or *sacrifice* be not expressed; & therfore belike seeing neither

any

Acutè diuus Thomas vt omnia Camp. rat. 9. argutissime. Canus. l. 12. fo 408. Melius diuus Thomas vt omnia dixit, Allen, fol. 419. p. 3. q. 83. art. 1 resp. dicendum ex Aug. ad simpl. quest. 3.

If Thom. had thought that Christ had bin killed & sacrificed to God his father (as D. Allen disputeth l. 2. c. 11) he needed not to haue handled it as here he doth Camp. rat. 5. Duræus eadē fol. 265. art. 17 cont. Iuel. fol 206. b. & 207. a.

Luc. 22

any *tearmes* nor words to make for it there; afterwards vpon more deliberation, he peeceth out the Euangelists & S *Paul*, for Christ said, *Doe yee this in my remembrance*, he readeth *doe yee or make yee this in my remembrance. Elephanto belluarum nulla prudentior, at figurâ qua vastior?* Of beasts saith *Tully* none is more wiser then the Elephant, in shape none more deformed. M. *Harding* was thought for that time, to haue dealt substantially against his aduersary; in substance of matter none more weake. Who can explaine how Christ is offered really in their Masse, & yet not in respect of the manner of offering? what manner & what respect is this? Or what words of sacrificing and offering did Christ vse at his last supper, without any tearme of oblatiō & sacrificing, *Hoc non est considerare, sed quasi sortiri quid loquare.* This is not to speake with discretion but as it were by lot & hap-hazard.

Reioynder. f. 283. & 305.

Tully de natur. deorum. l. 1. fere fine.

Tull. ibid.

But the truth is Christ vsed noe word, tearme or act of sacrificing, at his last supper. we maruaile not then though M. *Harding* say hee expressed it not by any tearme. Yet the farthest of from al truth is, that which in the prosecution of this article he deliuereth, which is, that Christ at the very same instant of time that he offered himselfe on the Crosse with shedding of blood, we must vnderstād (for a necessary point of Christian doctrine) that he offered himselfe inuisibly (as concerning man) in the sight of his heauenly father, bearing the markes of his woundes and there appeareth before the face of God; with that thorne prickt, naile boared, speare perced & other wounded, rent & torne body for vs. Here are 4 sacrifices made of one. The same Christ sacrificed at his last supper, the same Christ on the Crosse, the same Christ at the same time sacrificed in heauen, & the same Christ sacrificed in the Masse. How M. *Harding* can bring Christs sacrifice in. to heauē without his tormentors is hard to conceaue. *Annas Caiphas, Iudas, Pilate*; & the rest of that damned crew indeed for without those wretches, Christs blood was not shed, and without shedding of blood there is noe remission of sinne:

Hard. ibid. fol 209.

A necessary point of Christian doctrine & yet without al manner of Religion.

Where M. *Harding* ſhold euer find any ſuch doctrine deliuered before him I cannot iudge, except he did alight vpon it in *Melchior Canus*, who amongſt other idle & vaine diſcourſes of their Maſſe inſinuateth ſuch a thinge, *ſpeaking of an vnbloody ſacrifice in heauen, offered there by Christ.*

Heb. 9. l. 12. fol. 421. a Incruentam oblationem Chriſtus in cęlis fecit.

Stephan Gardiner ſometime Biſhop of Wincheſter, a ſure card to the poſters at Rome writing purpoſly of the *ſacrifice of the Maſſe*, beginneth wel, ſaith it is agreed & by the ſcriptures plainly taught, that the oblation & ſacrifice of our ſauiour Chriſt, was & is a perfect worke, once conſummate in perfectiō without neceſſity of *iteratiō*, as it was neuer taught to be iterate but a meere blaſphemy to preſuppoſe it. This is ſound & Catholike, if he would abide by it, but within two leaues after, hee ſaith wee muſt beleiue the very preſence of Chriſts body and blood on Gods board, and that the Prieſts doe their ſacrifice, and bee therfore called ſacrificers. If the Preiſts doe there ſacrifice, thē doe they either iterate Chriſts ſacrifice or haue an other. An other they wil not ſay they haue & then muſt they needs iterate Chriſts, which indeed (as he ſaith) is blaſphemous to thinke on. And againe he would inferre out of *Lumbard*, that the ſame moſt precious body and blood is offered daily, that once ſuffered, & was once ſhed. And yet in the next page he ſaith. The Catholike doctrine teacheth not the daily ſacrifice of Chriſts moſt precious body & blood to bee an iteration of the once perfected ſacrifice on the Croſſe, but a ſacrifice that repreſenteth that ſacrifice, & ſheweth it alſo before the eies of the faithfull, and refreſheth the effectual memory of it. What ſhould any cockle doe amongſt this corne? why ſhould he preſently inſert that the catholike doctrine teacheth the daily ſacrifice to be the ſame in *Eſſence* that was offered on the Croſſe once. Come to the compariſon betweene the ſacrifice of the Maſſe, and that of the Croſſe, of the ſtrenght vertue & force of the one and of the other, they knowe not what to ſay. The offering on the croſſe (ſaith he) was & is propitiatorie & ſatisfactory for

Ibid. fol. 146. b verie ſacrificers.

Ibid. 148. b.

Ibid. 149. b.

Ibid. 149. b. Of the vertue of the ſacrifice of the Maſſe and of Chriſts on the Croſſe. Gard.

Ibid. fol. 149. b. Chriſts ſacrifice on the Croſſe was & is propitiatory

for our redemption & remission of sinnes, wherby to destroy the tyranny of sinne, the effect wherof is giuen & dispenced in the sacrament of Baptisme.

Note well.

The daily offering (meaning the Masse) *is propitiatory* also but that it is not in that degree of propitiation, for to cal the daily offering *a sacrifice satisfactory*, must haue an vnderstanding that signifieth not the action of the Preist, but the presence of Christs most precious body & blood, the very sacrifice of the world once perfectly offered being propitiatory & satisfactory for all the world. And yet not ten lines after in the same page, he saith that the act of the Preist done according to Gods commandement must needes be *propitiatory* & prouoke Gods fauour, and ought to bee trusted on to haue a propitiatory effect with God.

Ibid, 150.a. The masse is propitiatory, also, so they make 2. propitiatory sacrifices, which cannoe more stād together, thē if they should make 2 almighties.

Here any man may see what a businesse & hard worke it is, to patch these popish doctrines together, what absurdities they fal into therby. One while hee saith that the act of the Preist must needes bee a sacrifice propitiatory. And now to haue an vnderstanding for the same, hee is driuen to a very shamfull shift, that he must either say cleane contrary, that it is not the action of the Preist, but the presence of Christ: or *else* that the action of the Preist is noe otherwise satisfactory, then al other Christian mens workes be, for so he averreth that all good workes, good thoughts, and good meditations, may bee called sacrifices, and the same bee called sacrifices propitiatory also. D. *Allen* hauing shewed by some reasons that both the sacrifice of Christ at his last supper, and that on the crosse stand well together, and are in their natures very commodious, addeth *(but it is saluo meliori iudicio)* according to his own opinio; that that sacrifice which Christ himselfe offered at his last supper, had not any other effect or greater strength, then the Masse of euery Preist performed in the Church now hath, wherby without question is confirmed the action of the Preist, or else *Gardiners* staggering is in vaine.

Tantæ molis erat Romanā cōdere gentē.

De euch. sacrif. l. 2. c. 10. f. 544. Quam hodie cuiuslibet sacerdotis sacrū in ecclesia.

And

And yet me thinketh, *Allen* himselfe stumbleth at this againe, when he would haue the sacrifice of the masse to be held, not an absolute and independent sacrifice, but to be referred as all the Iewish sacrifices were, to the only fountaine of sacrifices the death of Christ; why should it not be absolute & independent? since you say that Christs sacrifice at his last supper had noe greater effect then that of your masse done by the Preist: & that of your masse being the *same in essence* with that of the Crosse, what blasphemy is it in *Allen* to cõpare it with those sacrifices of the Iewes; & r-ferre it to the fountaine, that is to it selfe? Againe is it any maruaile if *Gardiner* shew himselfe vnconstant in these kinde of questions? The pure sacrifice of the Church (saith he) is there offered for the effect of the increase of life in vs as it was offered on the crosse to atcheiue life vnto vs. And yet in the verie next page out of *Cyrill*, he wold haue the sacrifice of the Church to be *viuificum*, a sacrifice giuing life. And yet he addeth which is more woũderful, that that cã be only said of the very body & blood of Christ: so that one where he deuideth our redẽption betweene the Preists sacrifice & Christs, the one to giue life, & the other to increase our life, & that is noe lesse then flat blasphemy; For al Christians doe beleiue, that the sacrifice made on the crosse doth both giue vs life & also increase & continue the same, & the Priests oblation doth neither of both, for our redemption & eternall saluation standeth not only in giueing vs life, but in continuing the same for euer, as Christ said that hee came not only to giue vs life, but also to make vs increase and abound therin: And S. *Paule* saith the life which I now liue in flesh, I liue by the faith of the sonne of God, who loued me & gaue himselfe for me. And therfore if we haue the one by the oblation of Christ, & the other by the oblation of the Preist, then deuide we our salvation betweene Christ & the Preist, & shal haue our saluation & redemption, as much by the sacrifice made by the Preist, as we haue by that of the Crosse done by Christ himselfe.

If

If any man rescue him by saying he referreth *vim sacrificij* that sacrifice *giuing life* to the body & blood of Christ, whether on the Crosse or sacrificed in the masse, then ouerthroweth he his owne distinction made before of *giuing and increasing life*, & maketh the masse an independent and absolute sacrifice, which *Allen* wil none of. Thus haue you a breife of what *Gardiner* hath said touching the sacrifice of the masse, where you see he runneth too & fro so astonied & amased as if hee were at his wits end, & knewe not what to say. For one while the Preist maketh a sacrifice propitiatory, an other while he doth not; now hee giueth life, now hee giueth none; nowe is Christ the ful sauiour & satisfactiō, now the Preist hath halfe part with him, & againe the Preist doth all.

Bellarmine treating of this same question, of the sufficiencie of the sacrifice of the masse. deliuereth according to his maner certaine propositions & distinctions of his own only making, without confirming them either by the holy scriptures, ancient Fathers or doctors, and hauing that liberty hee were very simple if he could not make a bad cause shew wel, especially to those that wil take any thinge for good at their hands vnto whom they beare stronge affectiō. For commōly such is our forestalled mindes, that whome in great things we mightily admire, in them we are not willingly perswaded that any thing is amisse. His fourth proposition therfore is *valor sacrificij Missæ finitus est*. The value of the masse is finite, that is, the masse is not of infinite worth or price. And this saith he is the common opinion of the diuines, & is proued most plainly by the vse of the Church. Marke his reasōs For if the value of the masse were *infinite* it were needlesse to haue many masses, especially for the obtaining of one thing For if one masse were of infinite value, it would suffice to obtaine al things, & therfore why should we haue other? And this is confirmed by the sacrifice of the Crosse, which for no other cause was one, nor neuer is repeated, but only because it is of infinite value, & obtained a ransome for all sinnes past

De missa, l. 2. c. 4. fol. 776.

Hooker. præf. ad lib eccles. pol. fol. 24.

The masse is of value finite

If this reason of Bellarmine bee good, against the value of the masse in the behalfe of the sacrifice of the Crosse: it ouerthroweth the whole masse & establisheth that of the Crosse.

The sacrifice of the Crosse is of infinit value

Ibid.post c.23. fol.596.

And yet me thinketh, *Allen* himselfe stumbleth at this againe, when he would haue the sacrifice of the masse to be held, not an absolute and independent sacrifice, but to be referred as all the Iewish sacrifices were, to the only fountaine of sacrifices the death of Christ; why should it not be absolute & independent? since you say that Christs sacrifice at his last supper had noe greater effect then that of your masse done by the Preist: & that of your masse being the *same in essence* with that of the Crosse, what blasphemy is it in *Allen* to cōpare it with those sacrifices of the Iewes; & referre it to the fountaine, that is to it selfe? Againe is it any maruaile if *Gardiner* shew himselfe vnconstant in these kinde of questions? The pure sacrifice of the Church (saith he) is there offered for the effect of the increase of life in vs as it was offered on the crosse to atcheiue life vnto vs. And yet in the verie next page out of *Cyrill*, he wold haue the sacrifice of the Church to be *viuificum*, a sacrifice giuing life. And yet he addeth which is more woūderful, that that cā be only said of the very body & blood of Christ: so that one where he deuideth our redēption betweene the Preists sacrifice & Christs, the one to giue life, & the other to increase our life, & that is noe lesse then flat blasphemy; For al Christians doe beleiue, that the sacrifice made on the crosse doth both giue vs life & also increase & continue the same, & the Priests oblation doth neither of both, for our redemption & eternall saluation standeth not only in giueing vs life, but in continuing the same for euer, as Christ said that hee came not only to giue vs life, but also to make vs increase and abound therin: And S. *Paule* saith the life which I now liue in flesh, I liue by the faith of the sonne of God, who loued me & gaue himselfe for me. And therfore if we haue the one by the oblation of Christ, & the other by the oblation of the Preist, then deuide we our salvation betweene Christ & the Preist, & shal haue our saluation & redemption, as much by the sacrifice made by the Preist, as we haue by that of the Crosse done by Christ himselfe.

[illegible] vero, [illegible] ter [illegible], si facit [illegible] trix. Ter. [illegible] d.act.4. [illegible] n.4 Gard.ib.151.b 152.a.

Intollerable blasphemy.

Iohn 10. Gal.2.

If

If any man rescue him by saying he referreth *vim sacrificij* that sacrifice *giuing life* to the body & blood of Christ, whether on the Crosse or sacrificed in the masse, then ouerthroweth he his owne distinction made before of *giuing and increasing life*, & maketh the masse an independent and absolute sacrifice, which *Allen* wil none of. Thus haue you a breife of what *Gardiner* hath said touching the sacrifice of the masse, where you see he runneth too & fro so astonied & amased as if hee were at his wits end, & knewe not what to say. For one while the Preist maketh a sacrifice propitiatory, an other while he doth not; now hee giueth life, now hee giueth none; nowe is Christ the ful sauiour & satisfactiō, now the Preist hath halfe part with him, & againe the Preist doth all.

Bellarmine treating of this same question, of the sufficiencie of the sacrifice of the masse, deliuereth according to his maner certaine propositions & distinctions of his own only making, without confirming them either by the holy scriptures, ancient Fathers or doctors, and hauing that liberty hee were very simple if he could not make a bad cause shew wel, especially to those that wil take any thinge for good at their hands vnto whom they beare stronge affectiō. For commōly such is our forestalled mindes, that whome in great things we mightily admire, in them we are not willingly perswaded that any thing is amisse. His fourth proposition therfore is *valor sacrificij Missæ finitus est*. The value of the masse is finite, that is, the masse is not of infinite worth or price. And this saith he is the common opinion of the diuines, & is proued most plainly by the vse of the Church. Marke his reasōs For if the value of the masse were *infinite* it were needlesse to haue many masses, especially for the obtaining of one thing For if one masse were of infinite value, it would suffice to obtaine al things, & therfore why should we haue other? And this is confirmed by the sacrifice of the Crosse, which for no other cause was one, nor neuer is repeated, but only because it is of infinite value, & obtained a ransome for all sinnes past

De missa, l. 2. c. 4. fol. 776.

Hooker præf. ad lib eccles. pol. fol. 24.

The masse is of value finite

If this reason of Bellarmine bee good, against the value of the masse in the behalfe of the sacrifice of the Crosse: it ouerthroweth the whole masse & establisheth that of the Crosse.

The sacrifice of the Crosse is of infinit value

and to come: But saith he, although the *masse be of value finite*; which is verie true in it selfe, yet the reason howe it cometh to be so is not so sure; For it may seeme strange, *Cur valor sacrificij huius sit finitus cum idem sit hoc sacrificium cum sacrificio crucis*, why the worth of this sacrifice should be *finite*, since it is the same, with that on the crosse which was *infinite*, & whē there is the same *host*, and the same Christ offering himselfe, which are *infinitly* acceptable to God.

A great maruaile.

The offeringe & the offerer, is one in both

Bellarmine might adde further of his own, if it pleased him A maruaile it is, how the sacrifice of the masse should be inferiour to that of the crosse, since that of the masse is *a most true sacrifice*, euen one of the tearmes he gaue before to the sacrifice of the crosse, And maruaile it is, that the sacrifice of the masse should not bee of the same value with that of the crosse; seeing as he saith one where there is the *the same offering & offerer Christ* in both, infinitly accounted of by God; & otherwher that the sacrifice of the masse *is a most true sacrifice* so in a third place, he grāteth that in the sacrifice of the masse it may most truly bee said *that the blood of Christ is shed there*. Take into these, the word *propitiatory* which the Trēt fathers giue to the masse to, & then if al these to gether serue not the turne, to make *a great maruaile*, why the *sacrifice of the Masse should be of value finite, & that of the crosse infinite*, wee may say as one said in an other case, nothinge I trowe will serue the turne: For grant those things of the masse, & it cannot but be of infinite value & price, aswel as that on the Crosse: but they knowe that none of those thinges are true of the masse, and therfore *Bellarmine* playeth a desperate mans part in giuing such reasons as cannot proue the masse inferiour to Christs sacrifice, except hee inuitably ouerthrow the masse it selfe, as *Hercules* in the Poet ouerthrew *Cacus* his den, whē heauē reboūded with the noise.

Ibid. l. 1. c. 25. fol. 749. & c. 3. in principio.

Ibid. fol. 49 in fine paginæ.

Iuel cont. Hard art. 1 diuis. 33. touching Amphilochius so highly renowned by M. Hardinge.

Virg. Æneid. l. 8. inde repēte impulit, impulso quo maximus insonat æther prima exparte hostię quæ offertur.

His reasons (*falsus meliore indicio*) are 3. The first is drawen frō the host which is offered. For in the sacrifice of the crosse Christ in his naturall being was there sacrificed & destroyed

in

in the forme of a man, but in the ſacrifice of the maſſe hee is deſtroyed in his ſacramentall being, but his naturall being is more noble & more precious then his ſacramentall. This reaſon thus drawen from the nature of the hoſt or thing offered is very friuolous & abſurd, eſpecially ſeeing *Bellarmine* deliuered before *that the hoſt in both was one*, where can he finde a defect in that? In flying from his naturall being on the croſſe to his ſacramental beeing in the maſſe, hee ioyneth with vs, for we acknowledge he died ſacramentally in his laſt ſupper becauſe a ſacrament of his death & paſſiō was inſtituted; & ſo when the Lords ſupper is now adminiſtred we ſay he is ſacrificed, becauſe the memory of his ſacrifice is celebrated. The ſecond reaſon is drawen ſtronger (as hē ſaith) from the party that offereth; for in the ſacrifice of the Croſſe, the party offering is the perſon of the ſonne of God; but in the ſacrifice of the maſſe the offerer is the ſonne of God by a miniſter. did he not lay it for a ground in the ſame page of the leaf (to take away an obiection) that Chriſt is the offerer as well in the Maſſe, as on the Croſſe? And hath he not diſabled him ſelfe, & his fellowes of a great excuſe, which they were wont to make in that behalfe? for when we obiect the perſō of the Preiſt, taking vpon him contrary to the ſcripture, ſo great an office, not called thervnto, as to offer vp the ſonne of God to his Father, they had to ſay that it was not the Preiſt that did it, but Chriſt that offered himſelfe by the myniſtery of the Preiſt: and yet now *Bellarmine* would diſable the whol maſſe as though it were leſſe worth that *Chriſt ſhould offer himſelfe*, were it but by the hand of a miniſter. The third of *Bellarmines* reaſons is drawen frō the *will* of Chriſt. For ſaith he, although Chriſt could obtaine by one oblation of this vnbloody ſacrifice, offered ether by himſelfe, or by his miniſter, whatſoeuer he would for whomſoeuer, yet would he nether aſke nor obtaine of God any thing but that by euery oblation in the

In his ſacramē tall being, you ſay that Chriſt hath there a real & ſubſtā tiall beeing. the Proteſtāts ſay he is ſlaine and his blood ſhed in a ſacra ment.

Ipſa hoſtia & offerens Chriſtus.

2. ratio ſumitur exparte offerentis Ipſa hoſtia & offerens Chriſtus.

3. Ratio ſumitur ex ipſa Chriſti voluntate, nam etiāſi poſſet Chriſtus per vnam oblationem in crificij incruēti, ſiue per ſe, ſiue per miniſtrū oblati, quē libet deo & pro quibuſcūq; impetrare, tamē noluit petere nec impetrare, niſi vt pro ſingulis oblationibus applicaretur

certa menſura fructus paſſionis ſuæ, ſiue ad peccatorum remiſſionem, ſiue ad alia beneficia, quibus in hac vita indigemus.

All the application in the Gospell nowe of Christs sacrifice commō both to Preist and people is that of the Apostle. Let vs drawe neere with a true hart in assurance of faith. Heb. 10. v. 22. Bellar. de miss. l. 1. c. 25. f. 748. H. 9. 17. 20. The Lords supper or Eucharist is this testament or seal of Godes promise exhibised to vs. The matter testamentary, or which is testified, is the sacrifice of Christs death as Christ saith this cup is the new testamēt, in my blood. Missa non est noua testamēti Christi inst. tutio sed est repetitio illius eiusdem. Ibic 25. f. 749. Neq; vnquam repetitur. ib. c. 4. l. 2. fol. 776.

masse there should be applyed a certaine fruit of his passion, ether for remission of sinnes, or obtaining other benefites which in this life we want.

Thus haue wee the ful of *Bellarmines* reasons to proue that *the value*, and strength of the sacrifice of the masse is *finite*, wheras hee confesseth the *sacrifice of the Crosse was infinite*, so that by his owne grant, the difference betweene them is, as betweene *finite & infinite*, which is disproportiō enough, wher vpon wee may safly conclude, the Masse is not the sacrifice of Christ. And thus hath *Bellarmine* like an other *Hercules* cleansed *Augeus* stable of a number of filth. For would he would bringe, not *three* but *three score* reasons to proue that the sacrifice of the Masse is inferiour to that on the Crosse, hee should willingly be heard. I wil follow *Bellarmine* in on note more about his masse, and so giue an ende to this part. Wee obiect the confirmation of a Testament dependeth on the death of the Testator, therfore the confirming of Christs testament dependeth on his death; Or thus, Where a sacrifice is, the testament is confirmed, but where a testament is, there is death, therfore the masse is a new testament, yea there are so many testaments as there be masses, & Christ must so oft die as there be masses to ratifie & establish them. *Bellarmine* answereth, that the masse is not a new seting forth of the testament of Christ, or is not a new testament, but a *repetition* of his owne, which he did & confirmed by his death, so a litle before hee called the masse *an iteration* of the oblation of Christ.

Thus is *Bellarmine* content to make his masse a repetition and iteration of Christs sacrifice, which a while after hee will not allow. For (as before is rehearsed out of him) speaking of the sacrifice of the crosse, he saith it is *only one* & cānot be *repeated*. So saith *Gardiner* very confidently. *That Christs sacrifice was and is perfect without necessitie of iteration.* If *Bellarmine* will stand to this that his masse is but *a repetition and iteration* of Christs testament, it may very wel bee demanded where the

Rhe-

Rhemists wil finde their masse or *sacrifice done daily vnbloodily, that was once donne bloodily made by the same Preist Christ Iesus, though by his ministers hands, & not many hosts as those of the old law were, but the very selfe same in number, euen Christs owne body that was crucified.* Annot. Heb. 10. v. 11.

Tub. I haue obserued you with attention in your discourse, wherin you haue shewed the diuersities of handlinge one and the same thinge. It seemeth they cannot tell themselues what they woulde say, if you haue laid downe their wordes rightly without falsification. For in this of the masse they teach the offering vp of the sonne of God to his father, which assertion had need (because it is a matter of the greatest waight) to be strongly confirmed by holy scripture; They teach a true sacrifice a perfect & reall, but when they come to confirme, that which first they lay downe, they speake of the formes of bread and wine, destroying the truth of Christs naturall body. They make it bloody and vnbloody. They knowe not howe farre the Preist worketh in it, nor whether they were best to say it is the same that Christ did. Their discourses herein are me thinketh vnprofitable and vncomfortable.

Articles subscribed vnto by the Church of England. art 31. Redemption act. 20. 28. Rom. 5. 6. Gal. 3. 13. 1. Cor. 6. 20. 1. Pet. 1. 18. Propitiation. Act. 10. 43. Rō. 3. 25 Heb. 9. 12. 28. 1 Iohn. 2. 2. 1. Ioh 4. 10 Satisfaction Io. 1. 29. 1 Pet. 3. 18. 1 Io. 1. 7. Gardiner. Saunders. Hardinge.

Rom. Vnprofitable and vncomfortable said you? you neuer iudged righter in all your life. For where the offeringe of Christ once made on the crosse is that perfect redemptiō, propitiation and satisfaction for all the sinnes of the whole world both original & actual, there being noe other sacrifice for sinn but that alone, they in stead of that brought in sacrifices of Masses wherin they offer Christ for the quick & dead to haue remission of *paine & guilt*, & haue handled the proof as before is set downe: wherby you may obserue the boldnes & impudencie of them in defence, & liking of their cause; who are not any whit abashed to bid the readers first, try, and examine, & waigh without partiallity their reasons and arguments, and then to iudge; which whosoeuer doth, shal assuredly finde noe sincere dealing, on their parts, but shifts,

cauills, and base trigiuersations, a sufficient proofe wherof is gone before and more shal now presently followe, in continuing their seueral declarations of the maner of the real presence of Christ in the sacrament (which I hindred before in discoursing so largly of their sacrifice) which I did reserue to this place because we are to examine the force of every word in the institution of the Lords supper, and their manner of contriuing them for their purpose.

The reall presence of Christ in the sacrament. Mat. 26. 26, 27 Marc. 14. 22. Luc. 22. 19. 1. Cor. 11. 23. 24

The sentēce of holy scripture, by which they wold proue both their sacrifices & reall presence in this. *When they were eating, Jesus, when he had taken the bread, and giuen thankes, hee brake it, & gaue it to the disciples, & said take yee, eate yee, this is my body. And when he had taken the cup & giuen thankes he gaue it them, saying, drinke yee all of it, for this is my blood of the new testament, that is shed for manie for the remission of sinnes.* By this narration of the Euangelist you see both what Christ did and said at his last supper, *He tooke, he blessed, he brake, he gaue*, and said *Take eate this is my body, Doe this in remembrāce of me.* Now I aske you this question, *what thinge was it which Christ tooke?* all men agree, it was bread. What blessed hee? bread. What brake he? bread. What gaue he? bread: & then said, take, eate this (what? bread) is my body. We say by this it is cleare, that when Christ said, Take eate this is my body, he spake of the bread as if he had said, Take eate this bread is my body. One the other side they expound it, Take eate this (*nothinge*) is my body, wee knowe not what. Or this inuisible thinge, Or this thinge I haue in my hands; but in noe case this bread is my body. For you must vnderstand, that in the triall of this one word, standeth all our whole controuersie both of the reall presence, Transubstantiation, & the sacrifice of the Masse; if Christ spake of the bread when he said, Take, eate this is my body, both they & we are agreed that the substance of bread remaineth, & so nothinge on their side wil fal out right, the reason is, one contrary thinge (*as bread & body*) cannot bee spoken of, or be said to be an other thinge, but in and by a figure

The words of the institution examined. This bread is my body.

This reason hath his force in nature confessed by al mē

gure

gure, ſo that to ſay of the bread this is my body muſt needes intend a figure. And becauſe they woulde avoid the figure, they doe violate the *eternall* law of *Reaſon*, which intendeth that if a man ſay *take this*, hee muſt meane ſomthinge, which he giueth or hath in his hand;

The evidence of this is ſo cleare, that I could confute thē diuers waies, but according to my firſt inſtitution, I will opēly ſhew, by their owne darke & perplexed ſpeeches, that did they not ſtriue to vphold a thinge once apprehended, they might more eaſier yeild then defend their errors. The Reuerend Biſhop of *Sarum* made this one of his queſtions at Paules Croſſe publikly enough, whether the people were euer taught to beleiue that when Chriſt ſaid *This is my body*, the worde *this*, pointed not the bread, but ſomthinge in generall, they knewe not what. M. *Harding* who ſeemed to ſay ſomthinge to every of thoſe articles denied by the Biſhopp, ſaid leaſt of all to this, which argueth he had not what to anſwere, leaſt he ſhould haue runn himſelfe vppon ſhelfe or other, there is ſo many diuerſities of opinions amongſt them in this. How this worde *Hoc* in that ſaying of Chriſt is to bee taken and what it pointeth, *we knowe* (ſaith M. *Hardinge*) who haue more learnedly, more certainly and more truly treated therof, then *Luther*, *Zuinglius*, *Caluin*, *Cranmer*, *P. Martyr*, or any their offspringe. We knowe ſaith he. But what hee knewe touching this point, nether he whilſt he liued, nor his freinds ſince he died, would neuer let vs knowe, vnkinde as they are Freindlier yet hath D. *Gardiner* dealt with vs in this ſame caſe, who hath yet giuen vs words, though we knowe not his meaning. When Chriſt ſaid this is my body, there is noe neceſſity ſaith he that the demonſtration *this* ſhould bee referred to the outward viſible matter, but may be referred to the inviſible ſubſtance. what outward viſible matter, & what inuiſible ſubſtance is there? Is Chriſts body that inviſible ſubſtance? Then the ſpeech will bee *This body is my body*: yet was not the ſame man alwaies of the ſame opinion (though hee would

Iuell. art. 24.

Hard. conc. Iuel. art. 24. f. 228

We knowe.

Gard. in his explication, fol. 39. b. referreth the word this to the inuiſible ſubſtāce. In his detectiō of the deuills ſophiſtry fol. 29. b. Now it demonſtrateth the bread.

would be called *Marcus Constantinus*. For before he had thus written: Christ spake plainly making a demonstration of the bread, when he said, this is my body. If it be plaine, why are they so obscure. For they dare not say what it meaneth neither one thinge nor other. A third of theirs, & a country mā of ours reproving the Protestants for referring the word *this* to the bread, saith it is absurd, both in philosophy & diuinity that two thinges different & distinct in nature & substance should be affirmed & spoken the one of the other.

Allen de cuch sacrif. l. 1. c. 34. fol. 420.

Disparata ſit oppoſita quorum vnū multis pariter opponitur ſic homo, arbor, lapis &c. iuſmodi res infinitę, diſparantur, nec eadem res poteſt eſſe homo arbor lapis. Ramus de diſparatis.

It is true it cannot be without a figure. So *Durens Quid obſecro, ſtultius, quam diſparatorum, vt dialectici appellant, alterum dici de altero? ac ſi lignum eſſe lapidem, aut murem Elephantum docereſ.* What is more fooliſh I pray you saith hee, then as the Logitians vſe to speake, that one contrary ſhould be ſpoken of an other, as if a mā ſhould saya peece of wood were a ſtone or an mouſe an Elephant. Theſe men (to avoid the figure) rectifying what is amiſſe in vs, haue made that crooked which before was ſtraight. *Allen* ſaith the word *this* demonſtrateth the body. But ſaith hee, if there be any man whome it doth trouble how the word *This* can demonſtrate the body & blood which are not there preſent, when the worde *This* is ſpoken: Or that they ſhould not ſhewe the bread and wine, which are there indeed, let him read *not the ſcriptures, (for thoſe ouerthrowe you) Gumundus* & *Thomas*, who haue largly, elegantly, & ſubtilly treated of theſe things. To amend al he ſaith, the ſafeſt & beſt way is to take the worde *THIS* in the beginning of the ſentence wandringly, & without any certainty, & nether to ſignifie this thinge or that, exactly vntill the ſpeech be ended.

Ib fol. 419. 421 Hoc demōſtrat corpus. vt ſit ſenſus, hoc corpus meum eſt corpus meum. This is it indeed that moueth vs. Bread & wine are there indeed. Vagè & indefinite nec per ſe hoc aut illud exacte demōſtrare donec compleatur oratio, Æneid. l. 4. Stapleton. turne of vntruths againſt M. Iuell. art. 1. fol. 16. b.

Stapleton is as variable as the beſt, we need not ſo much remember the Poet, *varium & mutabile ſemper fœmina*, a womā is an vnconſtant and changable creature, as maruaile at theſe Doctors in their vncertaine ſpeches. Now M. *Iuell* (ſaith he) doe you thinke it an vntruth to ſay, that in *Tertullians* time Chriſtian folke or the olde Fathers called that bread, the bo-

dy

dy of Christ, & so consequently our maker & redeemer? But what saith our saviour himselfe in the Gospell? Doth not he saie of that bread which hee tooke into his hands which hee brake & blessed *This is my body*: Doth not he in these wordes call it his body? To this we agree, we desire noe more, let him stand to this & the controuersie is ended. We say as *Stapleto* saith, that Christ did say of that bread which he tooke in his hands, which he brake & blessed *This is my body*. But hee will not abide by this, he goeth from it in the examination of the second article, for there he reasoneth after this manner. The scripture saith *Hoc est corpus meum*, this is my body: which *this* M. *Iuell*? Can you say, this bread is my body? you knowe *Hoc hic*, is the neuter gender, *panis bread*, is the masculine. Then what this? This forsooth which Christ had blessed, & made saying *This is my body*. Thus far *Stapleton*. Doth not his secõd affirmation frustrat his first, & his first the second? In the first he is plaine, Christ spake of the bread which he brake & blessed: in the second he wrangleth about the genders, and maketh interrogations, when he knoweth wel enough what it is as hee in the *Poet*, that said *Sed quid hoc? puer hercle est*, in noe case he wil not haue *this* to point to the bread.

By Stapleton here, Christ spake of the bread whē he said this is my body.

Stapleton. ibid. art. 2. fol. 41. b. Now hee will not haue it signify the bread.

Was it not bread which he blessed.

Ter. Andr. act. 4. scen. 4.

M. *Hardinge* comming as neere the truth as 4. and 4. is to 8. dare not yet stand vnto it, he telleth vs out of *Ireneus*, that Christ tooke the creature of bread (or that which by creatiõ is bread) & gaue thankes saying *this is my body*. Can any man in his right witts imagine that *Ireneus* did not thinke writing so plainly as he doth, that Christ spake of the bread whē he said this is my body. And saith himselfe in the next page that for signification of mystery, they brake & distribute also vnto others that heauenly bread in the forme of commõ bread. I hope to salue this they wil not saie that they breake the reall & fleshly bodie of Christ, & breake bread they doe though heauenlie, & heauenlie bread we doe not denie but the bread of the holy communion maie be called, when it is sanctified & made holy by the word of God and prayer, put

1. Reioyn. fol. 304.
2. Tonstall. fol. 58.
3. Bell. de sac. euch. l. 2. c. 6. fol 155.
4. Dureus cons. fur. resp. Whit. rat 9. fol. 657.
5. Hard conf. iuel. art. 17. fol 210. b.
6. Bell. de mis. sa. l. 1. c. 10. fol. 687.
Hard Reioynd. pag 305. a.

Dureus cont. whit. rat. 2. f. 114. Stapl. rect. art. 2. fol. 12. Reioyn. fol. 149. b.

apart for that holy vse; but yet bread and such bread, as of which the substance of our flesh is increased & consisteth, as they all teach with one ioint consent out of *Irenæus* also. I hope they are not come to that degree of blasphemy, as to say that our substantial & naturall bodies are augmented & doe consist of the real and naturall body of Christ. Therfore he must needes meane by their own trauises out of him that Christ both spake & meant the bread when he said *this is my body*: & such bread as is in vse amongst vs. You shall see further, how like they are in this one to an other, *Ecce autem similia omnia, omnes congruunt, Vnum cognoris, omnes noris*, all feathers of one winge, knowe one & knowe al, *Tradunt mutuas operas*. They help one an other, but bringe their causes to noe good passe.

Quam vterq; est similis sui Teren. in Phor act. 3. scen. 2. & act. 3. scen. 5.

Lib. 1. fol. 18. Saunders saith Christ spake of the bread. Gratiarũ actio Fractio panis benedicti. This conuinceth plainly he spake of the bread.

D. Saunders in his visible monarchy, treating of the sacrament, saith verie plainly *Christus de pane quem Apostoli nondũ acceperant dixit*. Christ said of the bread which the Apostles had not yet receaued *This is my body*: & then he handleth his *giuing of thankes*, & after commeth to the *breaking of the consecrated bread*, which I hope they wil not verifie of Christs reall body. And a little after the words of our Lord (saith he) in the Eucharist are referred to the Elements, for that saying *This is my body* is referred to the bread. *This is my blood to the Cup*. But after (yet a great while after so that wel he might forget himself) in the same worke treating of the same matter, he hath these words. *Disparata sunt panis triticeus & Corpus Christi*. Bread & the body of Christ are (saith hee) two seperate & diuers thinges; so that wee iustly saie that the proNow we cannot tel what to make of it. Nec ad visibile corporis Christi formã nec ad hunc panẽ relut qui maneat panis nec simul ad hunc panem & hoc corpus nec &c

noune *hoc this* cãnot be referred to the visible body of Christ nether to the bread, as it should remaine bread, nether to the bread to gether with the body, nor to the whole action of the supper, but only to the body of our Lord, *iam tum de substantia panis facta*, euen then made of the substance of bread, & exhibited vnder the forme of bread.

Thus doth *Saunders* here make Christ haue two seuerall bo

bodies, one visible their present, & the other made of bread & to that body there made of substance of bread hee referreth the worde *this*, in the sentence this is my body: so hee maketh the sence thus, *This body made of this substance of bread is my body*, which is a very vaine speech & to noe purpose, For by that exposition Christs body should bee there before the words of cõsecration were pronounced, & so there should be noe force and vertue in consecration, or rather there should be consecration before consecration, & so consecratiõ without consecration. And a little after he saith *At nunc pronomẽ hoc*. But now the pronowne *hoc this*, which sheweth the whol substance *rei propositæ* of the thing that is proposed or shewed; doth demonstrate noe other thinge then the body of Christ, not remembring what hee said in the first booke, as I even now recited; that Christ spake of the bread which the Apostles had not yet receaued, when he said *This is my body*. If he spake of the bread, he spake not of his bodie, if he spake of his body, hee spake not of the bread, and yet *Saunders* avoucheth both. In an other place going about to proue that the word *this* cãnot be referred to the visible body of Christ saith thus *Cum Christus post acceptum panem, & benedictionem interposit am*, Seeing Christ after the taking of the bread *and the blessing comming between*, did breake and giue to his disciples saying, take & eate this is my body, it is cleare by the ord & course of the sentence, that hee called that thinge his body *which he gaue*, & which hee commanded his disciples to eate; insomuch that in the deliuerie of the cup he said *Drinke yee all of this for this is my body*. In vaine therfore after the cõmandement of drinking, had hee added the word *for*, if the blood which hee then shewed, had bin beleiued to haue bin then only in the vaines of his body, & not exhibited & giue to haue bin drunke.

What thinge you are afraid to call it any thing.

Saunders ibid l. 7. fol. 633. Marke this that he cofesseth the blessing came before the breaking.

Two bloods one in the veines of his body, & the other in the chalice

In this last sentence of the 4. thinges in the supper which Christ did that is *his taking, blessing, breaking, & giuing*, *Saunders* seemeth to allow 3. of them to appertaine to the bread *tak-*

ing, *blessing*, & *breaking*, but not *his giuing*, & *their eating*: yet in the next leafe he commeth somwhat nearer, for hee confesseth that Christ did not only commande that we should doe that which hee did *by taking the bread*, *by blessing the bread*, *by breaking the bread*, *and by distributing the bread*, but that wee should leaue a certaine worke done at the table of the Lord after we haue finished all. So commeth hee now to the *distributing* or giuing of bread, & what should they eate, but what hee distributed, which was euen bread. After this, findinge the ill conclusions of some of his owne speeches, where hee referreth the word *this* to the body there presently made he doth deny that they resolue the sentence thus *hoc corpus meum est corpus meum*, this body is my body, but thus, the substãce which I shew is the substãce of my body; as if it should be said, *Behold the substance of my body*, or *Behold my body vnder these accidents of this bread*. Why mince you so finely with *substantia quam demonstro* the substance which I shew, what substãce is that? if the bread, thẽ Christ spake of the bread, which once you affirmed; if the body, then the speech must needes bee (maugre al gaine saiers) *This body is my body*: which nowe you denie. Take your foote out of which fetter you will, out of both you cannot.

Deinde cum Christus subiunxit hoc facite: non solũ præcepit, vt id ageremus, quod illepanẽ accipiendo, benedicendo, frãgendo & distribuendo egit, verum etiam vt opus quoddam relinqueremus in mensa domini post nostras actiones finitas. fol. 634.

Saunders commeth to the distributing of bread, & then must they needes eate bread

Ibid fol 637.

The substance which I shew? what substãce. This is my body that is behold my body where are the wordes which make the change?

Ibid fol. 639.

This is my body worketh the Change. Note.

Againe, where he resolueth or expoundeth the words of Christ, this is my body, as if hee should haue said, behold the substance of my body, or behold my body vnder these accidents. I demande where are the words of *Transubstantiation*, or that turned or made the bread, the body of Christ? For according to *Saunders* opinion here, these wordes this is my body, are but demonstratiue, as if hee should haue said. Behold the substance of my body: & then of necessitie the wordes that made it so must goe before. But where & nether they nor he can tell. But to my seeming he falleth vpon his old Bias againe which he did before, where he saith *Itaq, illa verba Hoc est corpus meum*, therfore those wordes, this is my body being directed to the bread taken & blessed, doe change the substance

ſtance of bread into the body of Chriſt. If they bee directed to the bread, the ſpeech muſt be, this bread is my body, how can they bee directed to the bread elſe. And if it remaine bread till thoſe wordes of this is my body, come, what neede they feare to ſay he gaue bread, for thoſe words cõe laſt of al yea after giuing & eating. He tooke (ſaith he) at firſt, not his body, but bread as it were a matter & element, whervnto his worde was to bee ioined, that it might be made a ſacrament: did he not ſpeake of the bread then, when he ſaid this is my body? Furthermore going about to proue, that the body & blood of Chriſt are in the eucharift, although it bee neither eaten nor drunken, he beginneth with S. *Paule*, who ſaith. 1. *Cor.* 10. The cup of bleſſing which we bleſſe, is it not a partaking of the blood of Chriſt: and the bread which we breake, is it not the participation of the body of Chriſt? and inferreth, we break the bread before we deliuer it, or giue it to be eatē For the breaking is both to reuiue the memory of the paſſion (wherin the fleſh of Chriſt was rent & torne with whipps, nailes, and ſpeares) as alſo that to every communicant a part & morcell.

This bread is my body.

Ibid. fol. 645. Accepit enim ab initio, non quidē corpus ſuum ſed panē velut materiā & elementum &c. Saunders Ibid. fol 658. 659. He breaketh bread, thē the reall body is not there.

At the firſt then when the bread is broken, it is the partaking of the body of Chriſt; for the bleſſing cauſeth that the bread bee the partaking of the body of Chriſt; the bleſſing I ſaie of the Lord, whereby he giuing thankes ſaid *This is my body*, and commanded vs to doe it, in his remembrance. Here is a gallimaufery of fuſtiā tearmes, wouen Lincy wolſy faſhion. He ſpeaketh of *breaking, & diſtributing of bread*, & yet the reall body muſt be there according to his accompt, beefore the *breaking* come, for that is his drift here: and then will he ſay, it is the reall body of Chriſt? Noe by his own confeſſion, it is but the *breaking panis benedicti*, of the cōſecrated bread as he calleth it before. Againe he ſaith, the bleſſing is don by ſayrng *this is my body*, but the order of the Evangeliſts is contrary, they place that bleſſing laſt of al. The wordes are, Hee tooke bread & bleſſed it, & after the bleſſing commeth the

Hee diſtributeth the bread in peeces, the reall body of Chriſt is not yet there thē. Prius ergo quā iſte panis frangatur, &c.

He tooke. 1. Hee blessed. 2. He brake. 3. He gaue. 4.

breaking, & after that, the distributing; & then this is my body. So that except he wil interrupt the narration of the Evāgelists and confounde those tearmes which are distinct, and refuse that for a blessing, which the Gospel pointeth & calleth a blessing, & on the other side, call that a blessing which the Gospell doth not, he can neuer iustifie his report. *Hæc est mendaciorum natura, vt cohærere non possint.* This is saith *Lactantius* the nature of lies that they cannot agree together. *Valet enim vi sua veritas*, but the truth doth preuaile of her own force whosoeuer resisteth.

Instit. l. 5. c. 3. & cap. 6.

If one or two of them did thus dote or dreame in their discourses it might be excused by the insufficiency of the mē but since amongst thē al, there is noe one that standeth sure either to himselfe or to his fellowes, it must needes bee iudged the weaknesse of the cause which they maintaine, that cause them thus to stumble. *Dureus* the Iesuite comming to handle this matter against *D Whitakers* saith, If Christ testified that which hee gaue to his disciples was his body, assuredly it could not be bread, from whence it necessarily commeth to passe, that the bread which Christ took into his hāds was changed into his body by the force and vertue of his diuine wordes? *Accipite (inquit Christus) & comedite.* Take saith Christ & eate. *Quid tandem?* what then? This (shewing al that substance which he had in his hands) is my body. Why how now *Dureus*, why walke you in these cloudes? why doe you not tell vs what substance that was which Christ had in his handes. Bread, or noe bread, the bodie or noe bodie. That which Christ tooke, he gaue, although you deny it, saying *panem in manus accepisse fateor, dedisse nego.* That Christ tooke bread in his hands I confesse, that he gaue bread I denie: but was not the bread which he took, that substance which you saie he shewed, hauing it in his hands, it cannot be otherwise for the words of chang as you saie, this is my bodie not come yet. If *Dureus* aunswere (as hee will) that he spake not of the bread which he tooke; let him yet resolue vs what substance that

Confut. resp. Whitak. rat. 9. fol. 601.

Hoc (totam nimirum quam manibus tenebat substantiā demonstrans) est corpus meum.

Dureus rat. 2. fol. 94.

that was which he had in his handes & ſhewed his diſciples when he ſaid *Take eate this is my body*. If he reſolue not this, he reſolueth not our doubt, but leaueth vs more vncertaine then before; for this is it that troubleth vs, how the word *this* can demonſtrate the body and blood, which are not there when the word is ſpoken; & not demonſtrate & point the bread & wine, which certainly are there then; as ſaith *D. Allen*: And if the bread & wine be there then, euen when the wordes *this is my body* are ſpoken; then are they there both at the *breaking* and *giuing*, as they vtterly woulde denie. Shall *Bellarmine* the mouth of their ſenate conclude the cõtrouerſie? yes ſay they we al agree: Heare him thẽ, a mã of a poliſhed wit. Although (ſaith hee) the Catholikes doe agree in the thinge, yet doe they not agree in the manner of explaining what the worde *this* ſhould demonſtrate.

Two famous opinions there are amongſt them, one that the pronoune *this* ſhould demonſtrate the body, which opinion he refuſeth as not conſonant to the truth, howſoeuer *Allen* and *Sanders* as you heard before, did ſo teach. The other is of *Thomas Aquinas*, & others verie manie whoe haue followed him that the pronoune *this*, doth not demonſtrate the bread *preciſely*, nor the bodie, but a ſubſtance in common which is vnder thoſe formes; yet ſo that the demonſtration appertaineth *properly* to the formes, but not that the ſence be *This*, that is theſe formes are my body; but thus, on this ſort this is my body, that is vnder theſe formes is my bodie. So that the word *This* doth not demonſtrate the bread, nor the body of Chriſt, but that which is cõtained vnder thoſe forms Therfore we doe not ſay (ſaith he) this, that is this ſubſtance or as *Scotus* this *Ens*: but *This*, that is the ſubſtance contained vnder theſe formes. Hete in *Bellarmine* you haue al that art or falſhood can deuiſe, to darken the truth with all. Doth anie man yet conceaue by them what the word *This*, *pointeth*

Feciſtis probã incertior ſum multo quã dudum. Teren. in Phor. act. 2. ſcen. 3.

Si verò quenquam illud adhuc moueat quomodo pronomina in ſacramentalibus verbis poſſint demonſtrare corpus & ſanguinem, quæ adhuc non ſũt cum ea efferũtur: aut quomodonõplane indicent panẽ & vinum, quæ reuera tum exiſtunt. Legat. &c. Allẽ de ſac. Euch. l. 1. c. 4. f. 420. Bellar. de ſacr. Euc. l. 1. c. 11. f. 83.

This, doth not demonſtrate the bread; nor the body according to Thomas.

It doth not demonſtrate the bread preciſly

Sic tamen vt demonſtratio proprie ad ſpecies pertineat. Sed in obliquo, hoc modo. Ibid. fol. 85. Ibid. fol. 88. This Ens, this thinge, or this ſubſtance.

vnto

vnto, but for very ſhame he wold ſaie it pointed to the bread he denieth it but in part, he ſaith it doth not preciſelie point the bread, & therfore I ſay he doth not preciſely denie it. His fellowes before him, will in noe ſort haue it ſo: But hee vtterly denieth that it pointeth to the body, yet is he more out then they, when hee ſaith the demonſtration *this* doth properly belonge to the formes, and yet the ſence muſt not bee *Theſe formes are my body*. But notwithſtanding his deniall it muſt be ſo, if he ſaie true, For if you referre the word *this* to the bread the ſence wilbe, this bread is my bodie, & therfore they denie it. If it be referred to the body, the ſenſe muſt be, this bodie is my bodie which *Bellarmine* denieth; And what ſhould let, but if he ſaie it pointeth to the formes, it ſhould bee *Theſe formes are my body*. But he wil haue it thus; That which is contained vnder theſe formes is my bodie; And what with him & them too is contained vnder thoſe formes, but the body of Chriſt? Bread they ſaie there is none: ſo according to *Bellarmine*, the ſenſe wilbe This body vnder theſe formes is my bodie; or otherwiſe to tel vs directly what it was, that was contained vnder thoſe formes. In the chapter next beefore, reciting out of S. *Markes* Goſpel the order of the Evāgeliſts he ſaith it cannot bee doubted, but Chriſt hauing taken the bread, bleſſed it, brake it, & gaue it to his diſciples; but as the breaking and giuing is referred to the matter which was in his handes, ſo his bleſſing too, ſhould bee referred thither which was to the bread.

This bread is my body. This body is my body. Theſe formes are my body.

Bellar. de euch ſacra. l. 1. c. 10. fol. 69. & Allen de Euc. ſac. l. 1. c. 15. Rhem an not. Mat. 26. v. 26. parag. 7. Referrur ad materiam, quę erat in manibus. Luc. 9. Marc. 8 Luc. vlt. Reſolue me in this and I will yeild the whol

We grant him (if ſo that wil pleaſure him) that Chriſt bleſſed the bread; and that Chriſt neuer vſed to bleſſe or giue thanks, but at ſome notable memorable worke, as at the multiplying of the loaues in the Goſpel, and bleſſing of his diſciples is read, & here in the inſtitution of the ſupper; But did *Bellarmine* euer read, that the *bleſſing* of any creature, ſenſible or inſenſible was the changing & tranſubſtantiation of the ſubſtance of it, ſo that it was not the ſame ſubſtance after, that it was before; if he cannot proue this, he commeth ſhort

of

of his purpose, to take needlesse paines to proue a thing not denied: For both he & al others of his side, when they speake of blessing of the bread, meane only a turning & change of one substance into an other, such a change as blessing nether can, or euer did work, & yet *Bellarmine* must remember, that in the institution of the supper, the breaking followeth after the blessing, so that here is a doubt what is brokē; bread there is none, & the Body of Christ I say must not be brokē; which consideratiō maketh *Bellarmine* salue himselfe an other waie by saying *To be broken agreeth not to the body of Christ but in the forme of bread*, what need hee saie, in the forme of bread? why the body of Christ is not there, but vnder the forme of bread therfore by him there is as very a breaking of the body of Christ, as there is a verie presence; a presēce vnder the forme of bread, & a breaking in the forme of bread:

Bellar. de miss. l. 1. c. 12. f. 699. To be brokē agreeth not to the body of Christ, but in the forme of bread.

D. Allen in two seuerall chapters goeth about to proue; First that Christ did blesse or Eucharistize the bread & wine & that with certaine words; next that those wordes *Hoc est corpus meum*, this is my body, are the words of *Consecration*, & that those two are both one; first frō the nature of the worde *benedicere to blesse*, he discourseth wonderfully both in *Greeke* & *Latine*: of the strength & vertue of it, & the vse it hath in holy scripture, & in the Doctors, & yet hath not brought any one example neere his purpose. For how can he say, that that blessing vsed by our sauiour was the blessing of the creatures & elemēts, an actiue blessing, a powerfull blessing, seeing he confesseth himselfe, that the Evangelists doe not recite any order of the blessing, nor expresse any more wordes, that belongeth therto, but only the words *blessing*, *& giuing thankes*: and also doubteth whether Christ did blesse by *auie words*, or by his intent and *will*, or by laying on of hands; For we read not (saith he) what Christ did or said in the blessing of the things: Notwithstanding this, hee is so far in loue with his owne conceipt of *blessing* by certaine words, that he bringeth the bread for an example, which Christ blessed at Emaus,

Allen de Euch. sacra. l. 1. c. 15. & c. 16. & Bell. de sac. euch. l. 5 c. 10. Rhem. annot Mat. 26 v. 26. parag. 7.

Fol. 291 Quanquam totam ceremoniam ordinem non narrent nec plura verba quibus ea seu Eucharistia seu Eulogia facta est.

Ver bonè an sola voluntate aut impositione manuum fol. 294.

Luc. vlt.

when the two disciples knewe him, (which saith he, is taken of many of the ancients to bee the Eucharist) although the Evangelist recite no wordes in forme how it was done: so that we may see what soeuer he is disposed to proue, be there scripture or be there none, all is one with him, he wil aduenture to perswade what liketh him best. And yet the same mā a farre of, in an other part of the same booke speaking of the same matter, as hauing forgotten himselfe, saith, That the text of S. *Luke cap. vlt.* and all the order of the narration doth shew that the whole action was like *to the consecrating of the Eucharist, bee tooke* (saith the Evangelist) *bread, he blessed it, he brake the bread* and reached it vnto them. If this action here done, be like to the *order* of consecration vsed at the Eucharist, then there may be consecration without addition of *This is my body*: which hee professeth to proue to bee al one, or to be the words of blessing it selfe, yea & without *receauing* at al for there is no commaund of eating.

No words of consecration, mentioned.

Allen eodem lib post. c. 45. fol. 480.

Now it is the Eucharist.

But I would not wish D. *Allen* or any papist of them al, to liue by the losse, for although they thinke to gaine by the practise of Christ there in drawing it to confirme their defaulking of one part of the sacramēt, from the lay people, because there is no mention made of the wine, yet will they lose by it (if the exāple were stronge enough for one kinde) because there is no mention of any consecration, & where no consecration is, there is no reall presence, and so they shall lose *Transubstantiation & all*: And can it bee the Eucharist without these? But howsoeuer *D. Allen* woulde haue vs beleeue that it is the opinion of many of the ancients, and of great diuines, that that is to be vnderstood of the Eucharist; yet *Bellarmine* who is more freer of his report saith, that touching that place there be two opinions amongst the Catholikes themselues, The one is of *Iohn* of *Louaine* & others, that it was the Eucharist, the other of *Iansenius*, that it was not the Eucharist, & both these great men with that side.

Allen trauersseth here this example to proue the cōmunion in one kinde lawfull for the lay people.

De sacrā. euc. l. 4. c. 24. f. 563.

But to returne to *D. Allen* (from whom I haue a little digres-

greſſed) & to follow him in his *Bleſſing* & *Conſecratiõ*. Wherfore (ſaith hee) it is to be beleeued that Chriſt *by bleſſing the bread*, vſed ſome word, & that he did not ſanctifie it, only by touching it, or by his power. And ſince it is iudged by antiquitie & almoſt by all diuines (although ſome few denie it) that Chriſt conſecrated by the ſame word wherby he *bleſſed*, & that *to conſecrate the matter, is to make the ſacramẽt*, it followeth that that ſame worde that is the bleſſing, is the forme of this ſacrament, inſomuch that it is al one to *bleſſe*, & *to vſe the words of conſecration*, or to apply the words of conſecration to the elements ſet before vs: Notwithſtanding this (ſaith he) it muſt not be diſſembled, that there are ſome diuines amongſt whom is *Bonauenture*, *Caietane*, & *Dominicus Soto* who affirme that Chriſt did not bleſſe by the wordes of *Conſecration*, & therfore to bleſſe the bread, and to conſecrate the bread was two diuers things in the action of Chriſt, & ſo the chãge was not made by the *bleſſing*, but after by the ſacramentall wordes. Which opinion (ſaith he) although it may probably be defended, & may ſeeme to be agreeable to the vſe of the Church, which nowe *bleſſeth* the bread by the ſigne of the Croſſe, before it vſe the word of *Conſecration*, and may leſſe trouble the order of the Euangeliſts, who after the mention of *bleſſing* doe put the breaking & diſtributing, & then in the fourth place *the word of the ſacrament*; it bringeth alſo ſome reuerence to the ſacrament, for if bread ſhould bee broken by Chriſt after it were conſecrate ſome ſmall mites, of the cõſecrated hoſt, might by likelyhood haue fallen away.

Allen vt ante de euch. c. 15. fol. 294. Quare creden dum eſt, Chriſtum benedicendo panem verbo aliquo vſum fuiſſe, & non ſolo tactu aut virtute eũ ſanctificaſſe. Et cum eodẽ verbo quo benedixit, conſecraſſe putetur ab antiquitate & pene ab omnibus theologis licet pauci quidam negẽt cumq; hic, vt ſæpe docuimus cõſecrare materiam ſit conficere ſacramentum ſequitur idem illud verbum benedictionis eſſe formam huius ſacramenti vt idem ſit benedicere & vti verbis conſecrationis, ſeu applicare verba conſecrationis ad elementa propoſita.

These reaſons (ſaith he) although they be waighty yet the ſafer opinion & more agreeable to antiquitie, and in euerie Church almoſt allowed, & which the *Tridentine* counſel doth in their catechiſme follow, is, that whẽ Chriſt *bleſſed*, he *conſecrated* the things ſet before him. That we ought ſo vnderſtãd,

To bleſſe & to conſecrate is al one. He commendeth this opinion with great reaſons & yet he refuſeth it. Ibid 295: 1 He tooke bread. 2. He bleſſed. 3. He brake & gaue. 4. This is my body. Tho. Aquin. p. 3. q. 78. ſaith the order ſhould be.

1. Hee tooke bread.
2. Blessed it said.
4. This is my body.
3. He brake & gaue.

that Christ *blessed* by saying *This is my body*, although the Euangelists by an *inverted order of the speech*, or *seting that after which should goe before*, doe put the distributing, & the breaking betweene the blessing, and the forme of the sacrament, which as it is very likly was done *after the consecration* or else euen as Christ did speake the words, *Fiebant omnia celeriter tanquam flosculi decidunt*. This trecherie and deceipt cannot any lõger be hid, it is apparent to all mẽ; Neither is it any maruel, that they who make of the Gospell as a thing made, to bee handled as they thinke good, should lose themselues in the labarinth of their owne diuises, as if reason had euen purposly forsaken them, who of purpose forsake God the author therof, For haue they these 1605. yeares been mounted on the stage of arrogancie, out brauing a better cause then their owne, and crying the Gospell, the Gospell, & you Protestants heretiks both denie & depraue it; & now doth *D. Allen* tell vs, freely and vnconstrianedly, that the Gospell will not serue their turnes, as the Euangelists haue deliuered the order of the Lords supper? What shall now become of Campians bragge *Agedum pagella scripta superiores summis, ac sententia scripti conferuntur*, Goe to saith he, we haue the better of it by the written word, now we must debate the meaning: No saith *Allen* the Gospel is not for vs; And I say, neither the writing nor the meaning of the writing, is any way for you. And therfore *Christo propior, ab hac lite remotior*, that age or antiquity which is nearest to Christ, is fartheſt off from thẽ in this controuersy And for that one hand washeth an other, & they both wash the face, & often one foote strengthneth an other, and they both stay the body; so the testimonie of Cardinall *Caietane* in this case shall stay *D. Allen* that hee be not vtterly ruinated because of his large graunt which they both haue yeelded in confirming the truth.

Camp. 2. ratio.

Caiet. comm. in 3 q. 75. art. 1.

Caietane in his Commentary on *Thomas Aquinas* vpõ this question, *whether in the sacrament there be the body of Christ according to the truth of it*, saith, that touching that prelent demaund

maund, & the reſt following for the more manifeſt & cleare vnd erſtanding of the *difficulties* in them, it is to be conſidered, that touching the being of the body of Chriſt in the ſacrament of the Euchariſt, there is nothinge writtē in the holy ſcripture but the words of our ſauiour *This is my body*, and thoſe words muſt be true. And becauſe (ſaith he) the words of the ſcripture are expounded two waies *either properly* or *figuratinely*, the firſt error about thoſe wordes, is, of them that did interpret *them figuratinely*, which both the M. of the ſentences, & Thomas doe proue in this article, & the ſtrēgth of the reproofe reſteth in this, that the words of the Goſpell are vnderſtood of the Church *properly*. I ſay of the Church, beecauſe there is not any conſtraint in the Goſpell *to cauſe vs to take them properly, ex ſubiunctis ſiquidem verbis*, for truly by the words following *which ſhalbe giuen for you in remiſſion of ſinnes* it cannot bee concluded euidently, that the former wordes *This is my body* are to be vnderſtood *properly*.

Vel propriē vel metaphoricē.

Et conſiſtit vis reprobationis in hoc,

There is nothinge in the Goſpell to cōſtraine vs to take theſe wordes properly & without a figure.

So here be two cardinals *Allen* & *Caietaine*, who ſay that not the Goſpel but the Church maketh for them. Is there a Church where the Goſpel is not? *Non iungitur Eccleſiæ qui ab Euangelio ſeparatur*, he is not ioyned to the Church (ſaith S. *Cyprian*) who is ſeparated from the Goſpell. S. *Ireneus* ſaith, *Columna & firmamentum eccleſiæ eſt Euāgelium & ſpiritus vitæ*. The Pillar and ſtability of the Church is the Goſpel, and the ſpirit of life. But the truth is, there is on their ſide in this queſtion, neither the Church nor the goſpel, nor any antiquitie, at all. To proceede with D. *Allen*, in the other Chapter ſpecified before by me (wherein he laboureth to proue that the words of Chriſt *This is my body*, are the words of Conſecration,) he is further willing to let vs knowe, what differences there hath bin amongſt their ſchoole diuines (who euer haue bin the vpholders of popery) about the words of *Conſecratiō* which they ſhould be.

De lapſis ſer. 5. Cont. hæret. l. 3. c. 11. fol. 237 Pariſijs anno. 1545.

Allen vt ante. l. 1. c. 16

Reciteth 4. ſeuerall opiniōs amōgſt them, touching the words of conſecration.

The firſt opinion is of *Innocentius* (the third who called the great councel of *Lateran* and decreed *Tranſubſtantiatiō*) who

The iudgment of that Pope is refuſed, who determined tranſubſtantiation for the

said

said that Christ did consecrate by his diuine power when he *blessed*, and vsed therein the power of his might, doing that without forme of words, which we cannot do without a prescript order, so that after he had consecrated he deliuered to vs these words, *This is my body*, by which words the Church should euer after consecrate. This opinion of the Pope is reproued by *Thomas Aquinas*, as beeing directly against the words of the scripture, and by *Allen* as being vntrue. The

2. second opinion is of some, who thought that Christ when hee blessed did consecrate, but with other words, thã those where with he taught vs to consecrate. But that opinion (saith he) cã

3. scarsely be excused from heresie now. The third opinion is of some who thought, that Christ did consecrate twise, once secretly whereby he did consecrate, and then openlie for the Churches instruction. But this saith he is most absurd of

4. all. The fourth and last opinion (saith he) is the common opinion, & without question Catholike, which, although in the explaining it be two fould, yet this in generall, it teacheth, *That Christ did then consecrate when he blessed*, & with the same words once spoken before the breaking & giuing, or which (as *Aquinas* thinketh) were spoken either before the breaking and giuing, or (which hee thinketh) to bee more agreeable to the texte) at the very breaking and distributing, that so *blessing*, *breaking and giuing bread*, hee saide, *This is my body*. Although (saith *Allen*) by reason of the order of S. *Marke*, I am brought into the minde to thinke rather, the former exposition to be true, & that it is not in *order*. For S. *Marke* saith, *& when he had blessed*, that is, *after he had blessed*, *he brake*; and so it seemeth not, that he *did breake* and cõsecrate at once, or altogither.

The 4. & last opinió, is their owne now, & How many amongst them, haue denied, that Christ did ether breake bread or gaue bread? Quanquam propter narrationem Marci adducor in eã sententiam vt putem potius priorem commentarium esse verũ & Prothusteron esse. Multò melius D. Thomas (vt omnia) dixit. Allen. fol. 419.

Thus haue you seene in briefe the discourse of D. *Allen* proving against his fellowes *their consecration*; But with such difficulty and hardnes, that in the conclusion, he leaueth the chiefest of his pillers *Thomas Aquinas* of whom afterward he

giueth

giveth a definitiue censure, that he saith *although better than his fellowes, Bonaventure, Caietane, & Dominicus a Soto*, thought that Christ did not blesse by the words of consecration, and that therfore with Christ it was two things *to blesse the bread*, and to *consecrate the bread*, & that there was no change made by the blessing, but after by the sacramental words. This opinion of his fellows, he confesseth, hath good matter in it, insomuch that it seemeth to be agreeable to their owne vse, & doth not disturbe the order of the Evãgelists, & doth bring reverence to the sacrament, and that these bee weighty reasons for them so to thinke; And yet as being Lord of himself, he chuseth such an opinion, as is most absurd in it selfe, & overthroweth the order and whole narration of the Evangelists: For thus saith the Evangelists,

1 *Christ tooke bread.*
2 *He blessed it.*
3 *He brake it and gaue it saying.*
4 *Take eate, this is my body.* They pervert the order, and say, Tho. Aquin. 3. p. 78. q. art. 1. ad. 1.
1 *Christ tooke bread.*
2.3. *He blessed it, said Take eate This is my bodie.*
4 *Hee brake it and gaue it.* And yet to see the miserable straights that these mẽ bring themselues into, they are faine to cleaue to the former opinion against themselues, for so in effect they say the breaking was evẽ as he did consecrate it: as who shoulde say the *breaking, blessing*, and *consecration* were done at once, because indeed they cannot tel what he brake whether his body, or the bread. So saith *Gardiner*, Though the words Take eate, goe before the words, *This is my bodie*, we may not argue, that they took it and eate it, before Christ told them what he gaue them, & al these rehersals of bread, with, *he tooke bread, he brake bread, and blessed bread*, and if you will *beld bread*: all these induce no consequẽce, *he gaue bread*, why? They doe manifestly argue that hee gaue bread, & not his reall body. Gardiner vbi ante. fol. 97. a. He brake bread.

If we may examine the Master in this point, we shal finde him

Sent. Lumb. l. 4. dist. 12. b. Diuersities of opinions touching the breaking.

him as vnready as the schollers, I meane in this matter, of what is broken in the sacrament. It was wont (saith he) to bee inquired touching the breaking & partition which seemeth to be there, whether it be a true breaking or no, and if there be a true breaking indeed, then wherein it is, and in what thing it is made, And seeing there is no other substãce there, than the substãce of Christ, it seemeth to be made in the body of Christ, but that cannot be, since the body of Christ is incorruptible, (because it is immortall and impassible. Therefore it pleaseth some to thinke, that there is no breaking, as it seemeth to be, but it is said to be broken, because it seemeth to be broken: some others say, That as the forme of breade is there, & there is not that thing there, wherein the forme remaineth, so there is a breaking, which is in nothing, because nothing is there broken, which they say is by the mighty power of God, that there should be a breaking where nothing is broken: Others deliver that the body of Christ is essentially broken, & yet remaineth whole and incorruptible which opinion they gathered frõ the confessiõ of *Berengarius*, who confessed before Pope *Nicholas* and others, that the bread and wine which are set on the Aulter, after consecration, are not only the sacrament, but also the very body and bloud of Christ, and that they are *sensually* touched and broken with the hands of the Priests and torne with the teeth of the faithfull, not only in a sacrament, but also indeed and truth.

1. 2. 3. 4.

The breaking is in the forme of bread sacramentally.

5. But the more probable opinion (saith he) is, that because the body of Christ is incorruptible, it cannot be said, that the breaking and partition is in the substance of the body, but in a sacrament that is in shew: in the forme of bread sacramentally: Neither may we insult or marvaile that the accidents of bread seeme to bee broken, seeing they are there without a subiect, although some say they be in the aire. There is a true breaking and division which is made in the bread, that is in the shew of bread: As the Apostle saith, the bread which wee breake, because the shew of bread is broken and divided.

Accidents of bread broke.

Thus

Thus far *Lombard.*

If any thinge were euer dreamed & not done, this doctrine is only deuiſed in ſhew without ſubſtãce what a breaking is here, & no breaking? bread brokẽ in ſhew, & the ſhew of bread brokẽ, & this to be a *communion* of his fleſh that was crucified for vs, for ſo S. *Paule* ſaith, *Is not the bread which wee breake, a communion of the body of Chriſt*, & if nothinge be brokẽ but in ſhew, let them ſhew me what is the communion of the body of Chriſt. Againe, were it not ſtrange if *whitneſſe* ſhould be broken, & yet nothinge broken that is *white*, yet ſo it muſt be if they laie true. *Stephan Gardiner* wil not haue the accidẽts to be broken, I would (ſaith hee) in other tearmes aunſwere thus, *That thou ſeeſt is broken*, & then if any aſke further, what that is, I would (ſaith he) tel him, the viſible *matter* of the ſacrament. O marvailous matter! you ſaid plainly before, that the bread was broken: And in the detection of the Deuills ſophiſtrie you confeſſe contrarie to your ſelfe in both theſe places *That the forme of bread only is ſaid to be broken*, which doctrine *D. Hardinge* taking to be the founder relieth vppon, & ſaith, *The forme only of the ſacrament is broken and chewed of the receauer.*

D. Allen forceably & as it were againſt the haire, erecting a new opinion touching this breaking wherof we now ſpeake faulting many Catholikes, for ſaying that the accidents *only* are chewed, broken & ſeene; affirmeth himſelfe, *that not only theſe things doe properly & truly agree & appertaine to the body of Chriſt (which did before agree vnto the bread) although by meane of the formes: But alſo by the meane & ſeruice of theſe formes & accidents, wee handle the body and blond of Chriſt truly, eate him, carrie him about with vs, & mingle his body and blond with our fleſh, teare him with our teeth, & can place him in this or that veſſell, and can ſhew by the ſmall peeces where he is, here, or now: & can ſacrifice him ſenſibly in the accidents, & can propoſe him viſibly to the eie to be adored, &c.* All which things whether they fall out (ſaith hee) to the body of Chriſt in the ſacrament in reſpect of it ſelfe or by

1.Cor.16.16.

Steph. Gard. vt ante f.134.b

Gardiner, darke & contrary to himſelfe.

Detection. fo. 15.b.

Anſwere to M. Iuell. art. 23. f. 227.

Allen de euch. ſacra l.1.c.37. fol.435. will haue ſomwhat broken beſide the body of Chriſt. Chriſts glorious body mingled with our ſinfull fleſh.

meanes of the accidents it skilleth not; so wee firmly beleeue that these things are truly and properly done to the body of Christ, no lesse then if he were in his owne shape, & forme, & no lesse, then they might be done to the very bread indeed. Although saith hee I am not ignorant, that *Thomas Aquinas* followeth an other opinion (especially touching the *very sight of Christs body* in the Eucharist) granting that the verie bodie may be touched and not the accidents only, but that the accidents & formes are onlie seene, and not the body of Christ, But as this mans opinion is not cleare, & by no meanes agreeable to reason, for it is most certaine that the body of Christ is no more obuious, & comprehended by meanes of the accidents of one of our senses then of an other: so is the doctrine & teaching, of other some schoolmen, touching the mouing, *sight, place, breaking, & eating of the body of Christ*, ful of curiosity & danger.

P. 3 q. 80. art. 4 ad 4. Allen leaueth Aquinas.

De moui, tactu, visu, loco fractione, & comestione.

Here you haue from *D. Allen*, that what the rest of his fellows haue fearefully doubted to affirme, he doth not sticke positiuely to deliuer, affirming every action and thing to be done verily and really to the body and bloud of Christ, vnder the shew of bread and wine after consecration, as coulde be verified of the bread it selfe before consecration, yea that the *bodie of Christ should be mingled most grosse with our flesh*. A position, as voide of all religion, so without all warrant, saue theirs that deliuer it, and not to sinke into a wise mans head, that euer they would deliuer such doctrine. A positiō which maketh our bodies to be fed and nourished, with the natural and substantial body of Christ, as we are with other meates. A position that ioineth the body of Christ with our bodies, in one and the same substance, For foode doth go into the substance of that thing which it nourisheth; and besides *D. Allen*, *Harding* auerreth, *That the flesh of man, is fed & nourished with the body and bloud of Christ*, and what more Capernaitical? So the Rhemists say, *That we are made a peece of Christs body & bloud*. But denied vtterly and expresly by the fathers, *Nostro &*

Corpus & sanguis Christi carni nostræ immisceantur. L. Winton. dialo. against the Iesuits p. 4. fol. 770. 771.

Hard. Reioyn. fol. 150. Rhem. annot. 1. cor. 10. v. 16.

& Christi coniunctio nec miscet personas, nec vnit substantias: sed affectus consociat, & confœderat voluntates. The coniunction, (saith *Cyprian*,) that is betweene vs and Christ, neither *mingleth persons*, nor vniteth substances: but ioineth affections, & *knitteth wils*. The mixture of his bodily substance with ours, is a thing which the ancients disclaime. Yet the mixture of his flesh with ours, they speake of, to signifie what our very bodies through mistical coniunction receiue, from that vital efficacy which we know to be in his, and frō bodyly mixtures they borrow diuerse similitudes rather to declare the truth, *than the maner* of coherence betweene his sacred and the sanctified bodies of Saints: but this is sundry other waies performed besides than by the Eucharist, as by his taking our flesh on him in his nativity, and by our regeneration in the water of baptisme, by faith, and the word preached; so that you see when *Allen* wrote as before is set downe, he thought to outbid those former schoolemen, whose doctrine hee taxeth with curiositie and danger; verifying that of the Poet, *O nullo scelus credibile in ævo, quodq; posteritas neget*, That no age, ever saw the like, and whereof posterity wilbe ashamed, making those that haue gone him even innocent, as *Tantalus* said of his nephewes.

Cypr. de cœn. domini.

Hooker. l. 5. pa. rag. 56. eccles. polit.

Senec. in Thyest. act. 1. & 4. iā nostra sub it stirpe turba quæ suum vincat genus ac me innocentē faciat, & in ausa audeat.

But see how it happeneth to those, that so peremptorilie and by their only authority abate the credit of others, even their credits wilbe againe abated. *Bellarmine* handling the same matter, affirmeth that it is a doubt of certaine amongst themselues, whether those things that are verified of Christ by reason of the accidents, may be spoken of *him truly and properly*, or by *a trope*. Some there be (saith he) (and it may be secretly he meaneth *Allen*, though he name him not) that will haue all those things verified of Christ *truely* and *properlie* in the same manner, as they might of the bread, if it were present: For the bread is *verilie and properlie seene, handled* and *broken* by meanes of the accidents: so will they haue Christs body in the Eucharist, to be verily and properly seene & hand-

De sacra. euch l. 1. c. 2. fol. 28. contrarieth D Allen.

led by meane of the accidents, *But the common opinion of the diuines doth teach the contrary*, that is, that those things cannot be spoken of the body of Christ, though by meane of the accidents *but by a trope*. Now if by a Trope, *Bellarmine* meane a figure, a signe or toke, as the Eucharist is, we willingly agree with him, and with *Allen* too, that whatsoeuer may be verified of the bread and wine before consecration, may be said also of the body of Christ: that *we see it, feele it, breake it, eate it, and that it increaseth the substance of our bodies, and feedeth them*, and that Christ is seene there, by all the faithfull, and handled with their hands, as the Rhemists, *Harding*, *Tonstall*, *Dureus*, and *Bellarmine* do quote S. *Chrysostome*, & the rest vnto vs: so as they will take with all, that which the same *Chrysostome* saith in the same place, *that the people standing about* (to receiue) *are besprinkled and made redde with that precious blond: and that we are not then conuersant in earth among mortal men, but translated into heauen.*

Then those that Allē checketh did teach well.

Per aliquem tropam.

Chrisost. de sacerd. l. 3. quoted by the Rhem. Heb. 9. 20. Hard. art. 6. fol. 137. Tonstall. l. 1. f. 71. Dureus 2. rat. fol. 118. Bellar. de euc. sacra. l. 1. c. 2. fol. 27. 29. & l. 2. c. 22. fol 120. tū vero turbam circumfusam pretioso sanguine intingi ac rubefieri.

If all this be too hard and harsh to affirme of the body & blond of Christ, let them consider it is spoken by *a trope or figure*, and verified actually and really of the bread and wine, which speech & the like are vsed of the fathers, only to draw their hearers from fixing their mindes below on the earthlie elements, but to mount vp to heaven, and their seeke Christ. For as the bread in the Eucharist is called the Lordes body, but in plaine and simple manner of speech is not fleshly and really the Lords body: so is the body of our Lord *sometime said to nourish our bodies*, and *feede vs*, because the sacrament of his body feedeth vs, and this is done in respect of the Enterchange of names; the sacraments bearing the names of the things, whereof they are sacraments; and the things having attributed vnto them, which is due only to the signes. If *Bellarmine* meane any other thing *by the word Trope*, than I haue expressed, he falleth from the vse of the word, and hath not satisfied the question, nor rectified his fellows error.

They borrow each others names.

But it is a worlde to see into what streightes the want of con-

consideration in these pointes hath driven the adverse part, proving their discourses to be hungry and barren, & hetherto without fruit, because they proclaime war against the general edicts of nature & reason. *Bellarmine* againe, to avoide the grossenes of *Allens* and *Hardings* opinion of the *mingling of the flesh of Christ with our bodies*, saith, That the body of Christ going into the *mouthes* of the communicants, passeth into the stomacke, & then the *outward formes* being corrupted and gonne, the body of Christ without any detriment to it selfe ceaseth to be there, and that the body of Christ, eaten by the faithfull, is not for the nourishment of the bodie, but of the soule. Here is the rule of Christ, and difference betweene the *body* and *soule* of man quite antiquated and confounded. Our saviour decideth that *nothing can enter both the hart and the belly*, and yet *Bellarmine* will haue one & the same thing, enter in at the one, & yet feed the other. If our soules be nourished, and not our bodies, as hee saith then must our soules eate it and not our bodies; Can our bodies eate, and our soules be nourished by it? What more contrary to al Religion? Eating, digesting, and nourishing, be consequent and coherent actions, and therefore they must al three be either corporal, or spiritual; If the soule be nourished, the soule must eate and digest that which is eaten; If the body eat, the body must digest and be nourished by that foode. Eating is therefore in vaine without nourishing; If then Christs flesh do enter our mouthes it is vtterly without profit to vs, if it nourish not our bodies. Thus are the wits of the greatest amongst the even snared in their owne gins. They handle the rest that follow as vngainly as those before, which lest I should cõsent vnto by silence, I will also set downe vnto you, & then iudge you of all.

De sacra. euch. l.1.c.14.fol.117. 118.

The Eucharist is no meate for the body, &yet goeth in at the mouth, and into the stomacke.

To the question, what it is in the sacrament that nourisheth our bodies, (seeing generally, they deny it, of the *body* of Christ) and taken immoderately *after consecration* will make a man drunke (as S. *Paule* reproued the *Corinthians* for their

One is hungry & an other is drunken. 1.cor 11.21.

Comment in 1. Cor. 11. lect. 4. in fine.

abuse that way *Thomas Aquinas* the father of all popery, and most acute disputer amongst them, leaving the grossenes of the one, & absurdity of the other opinion before, saith; That 1. some amongst them haue saide, That those things are not wrought by any *conversion*, but by an alteration of the senses of a man by the accidents of bread and wine, which remaine after consecration, for men haue bin accustomed to be comforted by the only smel of meate, and to be overcome, and as it were made drunk, by the abundant smell of wine. Some 2. others haue said, That the consecrated bread and wine, may be conuerted into an other thinge, & so nourish because the substance of bread and wine remaineth with the substance of the body & blood of Christ; but this saith he is against the 3. scripture; Some others haue said that the substantiall forme of bread remaineth, which worketh the operatiō, & so it norisheth, as the bread should nourish. Thus he refelleth. Some 4. haue said, that the aire roūd about is conuerted into the substance of that which is nourished, or into some such thinge. 5. But this saith he cānot be; And therfore some haue said, that by the power of God, the substance of the bread & wine, is restored againe to the intent that the sacrament might not be found in such like conversions; But that is vnpossible. His own conclusion is that the accidents & formes of *bread* and *wine* can nourish & make drunke, as wel as if the substance of bread & wine were there. So *D. Allen* (although he beeloth so to say) The formes & accidents of bread and wine are able to nourish, make drunke, & performe all the offices & duties naturall, that the bread & wine could when their substance was there. So the Romish Catechisme. Why is it called bread after consecration, say they? A swel because it hath the shew of bread, as also the natural property of nourishing & feeding the body, which is proper to bread. Is it called bread because it hath the shew of bread? by what figure? Hath it the naturall properties of bread, & yet is it not bread? say againe, & say truly, it is called bread, therfore it is bread. It hath the na-

6. The accidents & shews of bread can nourish.

De sacra. l. 1. c. 37. f. 432.

How can you seuer the naturall properties of a thing frō the very thing it selfe.

Part. 3. q. 33. f. 189.

naturall properties of bread, *feeding*, *nourishing*, as also the accidents *fauor*, *waight*, *tast*, *colour* and al, and therfore it hath the name & is indeed very bread.

They are so farre remoued from the center of trueth in these points, that rather then they wil leaue their wils, & shut vp the streame of their owne affections, they will leaue all hope of a sound beleefe. What eateth the mouse, if she (or he I know not whether) chance to catch of the cõsecrated host? Aske the schoolman (it becommeth their grauities to create such questions) It cannot bee said (saith *Lumbard*) that the body of Christ, is eaten of bruite beastes, although it seemeth so to bee, when the mouse eateth then, what eateth hee? *Deus nouit* God knoweth that, and hee that saith otherwise, is adiudged an hereticke. How then escapeth the Angelicall Doctor. *Quidam autem dixerunt*. Some haue saide (saith hee) that as assone as the sacrament is touched, by a Mouse or a Dogge, the body of Christ ceaseth to be there; But this derogateth from the truth of this sacrament: neither must we say that a bruit beast doth eat the body of Christ sacramentally but it must bee saide that the Mouse eateth by chance, as a man that shoulde eate the consecrated host vnknowne vnto him. Now *Gardiner* saith contrary, that no creature can eate the body and bloud of Christ, but only man.

Lumb. l. 4. dist. 13. a fine.

God knoweth that.

3. p. 80. q. art. 8 ad. 3.

Ibid. fol. 14. 2.

I let passe the rest of *Aquinas* prodigious & base discourses touching some other cautels, belonging to this sacrament, as if a spider should fall into the consecrated wine or poison should therewith be mingled; which although with warrant good enough I might lay the before you (*Tuberuile*) because I am by al honest & direct courses, to warne you to beware, you drinke not at that fountaine, whose faireſt Streames are so filthy and lothsome: yet I will omit him now, & returne to some handsomer discourse, and shew you that as they are found to faulter touching the particular drift of every word in the institution of the Lordes supper as *the blessing*, *breaking*, & *This is my body*; so if those were granted vnto them to bee

Ib. q. 83. art. 6. ad. 3.

The maine scope of this treatise & discourse.

as they would lay the downe themselues, & that we should agree and say with them that the *reall*, and *substantiall* body of Christ is present in the Eucharist, yet can they not tel you *neither the manner of the presence, nor according to what body that presence is, as whether according to that wherein hee liued heere in earth, or whether as it is now qualified and glorious in heauen. Whether with parts or without parts, neither are they agreed how hee is eaten. D. Harding* saith it is cleare by many places of holy scripture, that Christ at his last supper gaue to his disciples his very body, euen the same which the day following suffered death on the crosse, which haue ministred iust cause to the godly & learned fathers of the Church to say that Christs body is present in the sacrament *really, substantially, corporally, carnally*, and *naturally*, by vse of which adverbes, they haue ment *only*, a truth of being; so that we may say that in the sacrament his very body is present really, that is to say indeed, substantially, that is in substance, and corporally, carnally, & naturally, by which words is meant, that his very body, his very flesh and his very humane nature is there, not after corporall, carnall, or naturall wise: But *inuisibly, vnspeakeably, miraculously, supernaturally, spiritually, diuinely*, and *by waie to him onlie knowne*.

Art. 5. cont. Iuell. fol. 127. b. Christ gaue his diciples the same body which suffered on the crosse, & the same body is there corporally, carnally and naturally, but not after a corporal, carnall, or natural wise, but in visibly, spiritually, diuinly, & by way to him onlie knowen.

The maner of his presence is not locall, or natural, but such as God only knoweth Art. 6. fol. 136. Corporally & yet spiritually Carnally & yet diuinely. Naturally and yet supernaturally, and by al these waies, & yet by none of these. God only knoweth the way.

Againe, Concerning the maner of the presence (saith he) & being of that bodie & bloud in the sacrament, they (that is the fathers) & we acknowledge and confesse that it is not *locall, circumscriptiue, definitiue, or subiectiue, or naturall*, but such as is knowen to God only. In the next article, The body of Christ (saith he) is made present in the blessed sacrament of the Altar vnder the forme of bread & wine, not after a grosse & carnal maner, but *spiritually & supernaturally, & yet substantially, not by locall* but by *substantiall* presence, not by maner of quātitie or filling of a place or by chāging of place, or by leauing his sitting on the right hand of God, but in such a manner as *God only knoweth*, and yet doth vs to vnderstand *by faith*, the truth of his very presence far passing all mens capacities

to

to comprehend the manner how. *Historia maxima nascitur de modo.* If M. *Harding* knowe not how, it was in him an idle diligence to bee so copious in striuing to expresse the manner how. Hath not he told vs? He hath expressed our beleefe, & his owne *wo*: which is more then the manner how, *Corporally, Carnally, naturally* saith he, *Spiritually, diuinely* say wee. And yet he saith all, confounding *substantially & Spiritually.* God doth vs to vnderstand (saith he) by *faith* the truth of the presence. What need *faith* saie I? It is taken into the hād, from the hād conferred to the mouth, & there they fasten their teeth, and from thence to the stomacke.

Bellar. de sac. euch. l. 1. c. 2. f. 28. 29.

The senses of sight, & feeling haue their offices here, faith hath none, nether is it hard to comprehend all this and more two. Here is also one, & the same Christ with proportion of body & members distinct, each from other, & also without distinction of mēbers & patts which ouerthroweth the truth of a naturall body; and yet so they make him at one and the same time at the table and vnder the shew of bread, not by local but by substantiall presence, not by maner of quantity or filling of a place: and yet the same mā did saie before, that the reall body of Christ is on that holie table *put* and *laid* the better to signifie the reall presence. *Put* and *laid* (as all men knowe according to the natural signification, require scituation of place and bodily description. How doth hee not fill a place, when he is *put* & *laid* there? *Stephan Gardiner* is as far at odds with his owne reason in this matter as *D. Harding*: Whē we acknowledge by faith (saith hee) Christs body present, although we saie it is present truly, really, substantially, yet we saie our senses be not priuie to that presence, *ne the maner of it* but by instruction of faith, and therfore we say Christs body is not locally present, nor by maner of quantitie, but inuisibly, and *in no sensible maner*, but marueilously in *a sacrament*, & *mysterie truly*, and in such a *spirituall maner*, as wee cannot define & determine, and yet by faith we knowe his body present, *the parts of which be in themselues distinct one from another,*

Art. 5. fol. 130. b. Put & laid. Fide intelligamus situm in sacra illa mēsa, agnum illū dei sunt verba magni Niceni Synodi ex Cut Tonstall lib. 1. de euchar. fol. 40. & Bellarm. de sacra. euch. l. 2. c. 10. f. 183. Step. Gard. f. 21. b.

in their owne substance, but not by circumscription of severall places to be comprehended of vs. What M^r. did *Gardiner* follow in this? Christs body is not locally present, and yet hath distinction of parts. Christs bodie hath distinction of parts, and yet not by circumscription of severall places to be comprehended of vs. *Thomas* of *Aquine* denieth this, The determinate distance of parts in a natural bodie, is in respect of the dimensiue quātitie *such a distāce of parts* (saith he) is in the true body of Christ but according to that distance of parts, he is not in this sacrament, but he is there according to the *manner of his substance*, Here, besides the disagreemēt of *Thomas* from *Gardiner*, *Thomas* hath framed such a Christ, as indeed is no Christ, hee hath nether quantitie nor proportion, of body, nor distance of parts: yet he confesseth that his true body in heauen hath so: and if his bodie in the sacrament haue not so, then ether he ouerthroweth the truth of Christ body, or else it will ineuitably follow without any qualifications, ifs, or ands, that the true body of Christ is not in the sacrament. *Gardiner* saith *The body of Christ is there in no sensible maner* as before, *Allē* saith *Corpus Christi est sensibiliter in sacramento*, The body of Christ is sensibly in the sacrament. Againe within three pages doth *Gardiner* contradict himselfe twise verie directly. In the first he saith *Christ in the sacrament giueth truly his flesh to bee eaten, the same which he tooke of the Virgin.* Next *wee receaue not in the sacrament Christs flesh that was crucified, being so a visible & mortall flesh, but Christs flesh glorious, incorruptible & impassible, a godly, & spirituall flesh.* And yet, so constant is he, in the very next page, he striueth to proue out of S. *Ierome* & others, that they doe not meane that *we eate the flesh of Christ as he sitteth in heauen raigning.* Some *Ioseph* or *Daniel* must expound these dreames. First, wee receaue not the flesh, that was crucified, Lastly we receaue him not as hee sitteth in heauen raigning and is glorified, So by this reckning nether first nor last, doe we receaue him at al. How can *Bellarmine* saie, and saie trulie, That the body of Christ hath his naturall maner of being in hea-

P. 3. q. 76. art. 3. ad 2. Distance of parts is in the true body of Christ. but not in that bodie which is in the sacrament.

Allen vt ante fol. 435.

Fol. 87. b.

Fol. 89. a.

De Euch. sac. l. 3. c. 2. fol. 24.

heauen, but in the ſacrament it hath not his naturall but *ſacramentall* (which we alſo ſay) and yet that *ſacramentall* maner to be expreſſed by the word *ſubſtantially*? And againe to ſaie That whereſoeuer the bodie of Chriſt is, there hee hath his forme & humane ſhape & ſcituation of parts & order whith he hath in heauen, and that he is in the ſacrament aſwel as in heauen, & yet in the one to fill a place, and haue diſtinction of parts; And in the other to fil no place, and yet haue his dimenſions & diſtinction of parts: which is verie hard. Againe he teacheth that the bodie of Chriſt in the Euchariſt is, *verũ, reale, naturale, animatum, quantum, coloratum, &c.* A true bodie, reall, natural, hauing life bigge or greate, & coloured; & yet we maie not ſaie that it is *ſenſible, viſible, to be touched, ſtretched out*, although it be ſo in heauen.

Ibid. l. 3. c. 7. 317, 320.

Ibid. l. 1. c. 2. fo. 26, 27.

Bellarmine in this controverſie is like *Turnus* in the ſkirmiſh with *Eneas petit aquora Turnus*, he traverſeth the field, as though he would do much; but *incertos implicat orbes*, but his turnings and rounds fore-ſhewed his ill ſucceſſe, *nam perfidus enſis frangitur in medioq; ardentem deſerit ictu*, His treacherous ſword brake and left him burning in rage in the heate of the conflict: ſo doth *Bellarmines* owne wordes confute his cauſe. Hath the body of Chriſt whereſoeuer it be, his forme & humane ſhape and ſcituation of parts, and yet may we not ſaie, it is *extenſum*, extended into place, and yet may we ſay, that he wanteth not his *dimenſions* nor is without ſhape & countenance in the Euchariſt? What ſhould hold in the extenſiõ? *Allen* alloweth the word *ſenſibiliter* ſenſibly, *Bellarmine* refuſeth it; and ſo doth he *corporally*, which *Harding* and ſome of the reſt vſeth. *Bellarmine* holdeth the word *ſpiritualliter* ſpiritually, as a man holdeth a wolfe by the eares, where there is danger in holding him and danger in letting of him go; Hee confeſſeth that S. *Bernard* vſeth it, and oppoſeth it to *carnaliter* carnally, ſpeaking of the ſacrament, *tamen non videtur hac vox multum frequentãda*, yet that word (ſaith he) ſeemeth not much to be vſed, becauſe there is danger in it. Thus muſt

Virg. in Æneid. l. 12.

Nos non dicimus Chriſti corpus in Euchariſtia dimenſionibus aut facie carere. In ſermone de ſancto Martino twiſe cited by Bellar. l. 1. c. 2. fol. 27. & l. 2. c. 11. fo. 186.

Bellarmines conceipt be the modell, whereto our faith must be framed.

He saith further, That the counsel of Trent expressed the maner of Christs presence in the sacrament by the word *Realiter really*, opposing it against the counterfeit terme of *Calvin*, who will haue him so present, that he be apprehended *by faith* (and so S. *Bernard* saith also, in the same place *Bellarmine* quoteth vnto vs) And that they vse the word *substantialiter substantially*, against the Calvenists also, who teach that the body of Christ according to the *substance* is only in heauen, *but I know not* (saith hee) *what vertue and power they derive from thence to vs*. Will they stande to this? Strange it were, they should sup vp their owne wordes againe, so plainly deliuered. How oft doth *Gardner* tell vs, that, but *by faith* hee knoweth not howe Christ is present in the sacrament. God doth vs to vnderstand *by faith* the truth of Christs presence. And *Bellarmine* himselfe within fowre howers reading after, answering to the ancient father *Athanasius* (who saith *the flesh of Christ is our spiritual nourishment*, and *spiritually distributed*) is driven to say that it is most rightly called our *spirituall foode*, because it is *giuen for the food of the spirit*, and not *of the bodie*, and *distributed spiritually*. And that Christ made mention of his ascension to shew that *his flesh is not to be eaten as other meates are*, which was the carnall vnderstanding of the Caparnaites *sed spirituali quodam modo but after a certaine spirituall maner*. Is not *Bellarmine* come to that terme which hee was so much afraide of? If the Caparnaites were grosse and fleshly in thinking that Christs flesh was to be eaten *more aliarum carnium*, as other flesh is; I am well assured *Bellarmine* is a Caparnaite also, & he hath as grosse a conceipt of Christs flesh, as they could haue, for hee saith the flesh of Christ is transferred from the hand to the mouth, & from the mouth to the stomacke; which I vnderstand to be as the manner of other meate is, and this he inculcateth more than once. And if *Really* be opposed and set, to exclude our terme *by faith*, as

Really, & substantially vsed by the Trent Counsel & opposed against the tearmes vsed by the Calvinists.

Ibid. fol. 20 a. & 21. b & Harvt ante 136.

Athanasius vseth the word spiritually.

Christs body is food for the spirit and not for the body. Bellar de sacr. euch. l. 2. c. 11. fol. 186.

Bellar vt ante l. 1 c 2. fol. 28. & l. 2. c. 8. f. 163. & l. 1. c. 11. fol. 92. most grosse absurditie.

Bel-

Bellarmine saith it is, let him shewe why it is not opposed against *spirituallie*, and *spirit*, and *spirituall manner*, which they and he vse also. We say it is receiued *by faith*, he saith it is *meate for the spirit, and not for the bodie*, most absurdly putting that thing out, from being meate for the body which is taken into the *hand, mouth, and stomacke*; and making that a spirituall food and nourishment, and which is receiued after *a spirituall manner*, and *apprehended by faith*, to goe into the mouth and downe into the stomacke, by humane & natural instrumēts, as the hand, tongue, and palate. And then againe hee doth most strangely leaue himselfe in ioining the hand, mouth, tongue, pallate and stomacke, in the eating of the body of Christ, and yet deny the chewing or grinding of the teeth which necessarily accompanieth the rest, especially having told vs before, that *infigimus dentes carni christi*, we fasten our teeth in the flesh of Christ. Neither is this *Bellarmines* case alone when he is pressed with any authority of the fathers, to fly to our very termes and to vse our phrases, but al others of thē also do the like. *Dureus* being vrged with S. *Augustines* authority, touching the eating of Christ in the sacrament, saith that S. *Augustine* accounted it an horrible thing to eate the flesh of Christ as we do other meates that are solde in the shambles, and that therefore he calleth vs from that kinde of eating *ad spirituale alum*, to an other kinde that is *spiritual*, & such an one, as is agreeable to that sacrament, but yet a true and reall eating. Here he both commeth to our terme *spirituall*, and yet confoūdeth it with *reall*, which S *Augustine* whose minde he interpreteth neuer vsed: & which *Bellarmine* saith, the counsel vsed in opposition to that other. A third Iesuite is mightily busied like a builder of the tower of Babel vsing a contrary language to that, with which he began his work, for being troubled as his fellow Iesuit was, with answering to S. *Augustine* (a father who is most plaine against them) is fain to expresse that manner of eating which S. *Augustine* speaketh of to be done, *dentibus fidei*, with the teeth of our faith,

Attritio dentibus facta. Bellar. ib. f. 29.

Vt ante ratio. 2. fol. 105.

A spirituall kind of eating a naturall and substantiall thinge.

If reall be vsed in oppositiō to spirituall, how can real, interpret spirituall, as Dureus saith.

Torrens conf. au l. 3. de fact. Euch c. 4. fol. 318. b. in gloss. Carné christi sacramento panis valet.

but the body is hid vnder the shewe of bread, which latter clause S. *Augustine* never vsed, to shew the maner of Christs body in the sacrament. That is only the Iesuits couler to avoide S. *Augustine*, and no part of his meaning. The teeth of our body, cā & doth as they say *eate Christs* flesh in the shew of bread, what need we vse *the teeth* of our *faith*, or the *eies of our faith* either, to see it there, as an other of them saith, if hee be really and substantially present in the host, the same flesh that the Virgin *Marie* did beare, and the Iews crucified.

With the teeth of our faith with the eies of our faith. Lud. Granat. de freq. commun fol. 100. vt ante f. 20. a. 21. b. 55. 40. 41. & 72. a.

But in a spiritual maner. I knowe by faith, that I haue it in my hand. A grosse & dull speech. The presence is only spirituall.

Stephan Gardiner as is before noted vseth the same. *I knowe by faith Christ to be present; we acknowledge by faith Christs bodie present. Christs bodie there is present but in a spirituall manner. It is called a spirituall maner of presence.* And yet in receiving that sacrament, *men vse their mouthes and teeth, being by faith instructed that they doe not teare, consume or violate that most precious bodie and bloud. Onlie faithfull men by faith can vnderstande this misterie of eating Christs flesh in the sacrament.* And, *the manner of presence is onlie spirituall.* What need faith? What need *spiritual manner onlie? What needes faith to bee the instructor*, when the Councell as *Bellarmine* saith hath deuised those strong & able termes of *truelie, reallie*, and *substantiallie*, and opposed thē against our imaginary termes, of *spirituallie* and *by faith*, which imaginary termes they vse also. Cardinal *Caietane* in excuse of those divines who drew the forme of *Beringarius* confessiō which was most grosse, touching the eating of Christ in the sacrament vseth no other word *but spirituallie*, and saith it is most false to affirme, that they held, that the body of Christ is taken *corporallie*, for it is taken *spirituallie* in the Eucharist *by beleeing*, and not by receiving it. Againe he saith, They eate the true body of Christ in the sacrament, not corporally but *spiritually*. The corporal eating is but of the sacramētal signes, but the spiritual eating, which is performed by the soule, obtaineth the flesh of Christ which is in the sacrament. If *Bellarmine* abridge *Caietane* of the word *spirituallie*, he leaueth him never an other to expresse his minde by.

Tom. 2. trac. 2. c. 3. & 5. annexed to the 1. p of Tho. Aquin. & sōtime to the 3.

The body of Christ is taken spiritually in the Eucharist.

Now,

Now to drawe towards an end in this point, let vs laie in breefe what wee vnfolded more largly. *Our Lord and sauiour Iesus Christ God & man is truly, really, & substantially contained vnder the forme and shew of bread and wine. He is transferred from the haude to the mouth, we fasten our teeth into his flesh, and from thence he goeth into the stomacke, and is mingled with our flesh, &c.* And compare them with these of the same men in the same matter. *Christ is in the sacrament Spiritually, the maner of his presence is only Spirituall: he is eaten after a certaine Spirituall manner The flesh of Christ is meate for the spirit, & not for the body: It is a Spirituall nourishment. By faith we vnderstand he is there, We see him with the eies of our faith, & eate him with the teeth of our faith by beleeuing & not by receauing.* If euer there were a difference betweene the body and soule, heauen & hel, light and darknesse, sweete and sower, ioye & paine, fire and water, North & south, & whatsoeuer may bee imagined to bee contrarie, then is there a repugnancy in those their wordes expressing their meanings in the matter of the sacrament. They will haue both true, and yet our opinion must bee false and hereticall in vsing the later stile to expresse our meanings: But as wee and they are most opposite, in the question, so are one sort of their tearmes, which they vse against vs, vnto an other, and such as can neuer verifie the truth of their assertion. If they can reconcile all, and proue vs heretikes, I saie they maie vndertake any thinge, yea though it be to the making of a black horse white, or a white horse blacke, as that cunning *Grecian Autolycus did.* Of whom it is said, *Candida de nigris, & de candentibus atra facere assueuerat.* Although it hath beene a long time thought, that they could doe much, yet I hope they can make no contradictorie propositions both true where euermore if one bee true, the order wilbe ineuitably false.

Trent counsel. Caietane. Bellarmine. Allen. Hardinge. Gardiner.

Ouid. Met. l. 11

Tub. I assure my selfe, so much as you haue said, out of their owne bookes & writings wil make anie reasonable mā astonied to thinke, with how faire & plausible tearmes, they wil

vil plead their religion, as though there were agreement no where but amongst them; & disagreemēt everie where saue with them; where if your collections & quotations stand true & sound, I see not but they maie haue leaue to goe aside, & pen a new forme of wordes, wherby to expresse their meanning in this point, for the old wil not serue them.

Rom. Yea and a new Gospel too, for *Allen* & *Caietane*, confesseth both against themselues; the one that the order of the Euangelists is peruerted, and standing as it doth wil not serue their turne. The other, that there is nothing in the Gospell that doth binde vs to take those wordes in the proper signification as they sound, to make the reall and substantiall body of Christ present vnder the shew of bread. In explicating of which their opinion, you may now call to minde the grossest of the figures which they vse, and let passe a many of others, in those few words of Christ at his last supper.

Allen Caietane.

Figures vsed by them in the sacramēt.

First they saie (*Christ tooke bread, he blessed*) that is he transubstantiateth, or changeth it, *he brake*, not the bread, but the accidents, or shew of bread, he gaue not the *bread*, but his own bodie. How they expound the word (*This*) in the sentence This is my body, you haue heard before. This, that is, that which is contained vnder these shewes is my bodie. Againe, where the words lie in the Euangelists *Take eate this is my bodie*, they haue deuised an hideous figure of figures which is called *Hysteron Proteron* the Cart before the horse, and say it should be *This is my body, take eate*. Christ blessed (saie they) by saying *This is my body*, although the Euāgelists place it not so in order. How manie figures & how often are they out, in the breaking, some saying one thing and some say an other. And in the wordes of consecration which and where they should be. And of the accidents being there in nothing, that is *whitnesse* and nothing *white*, *Roundnesse* and nothing *round*, *colour*, and nothing *coloured*, and an hundred monsters & differences else amongst them, hath this one monster *Transubstantiation* begot. But when was the monster himselfe begot-

1. 2. 3. 4. 5. 6. 7. 8. 9.

The antiquity of Transubstantiation.

ten?

ben? It was holidaie at Rome then, he is not so old by 1200. yeares and more as you haue by told & made beleeue.

Our countrie man *Twysden* telleth vs it was concluded in the coūsel of Lateran, held vnder *Innocentius* the third Pope of that name. Before which time (saith he) there was 3. opinions concerning that matter, some thought that the bodie of Christ was there together with the bread, as fire in a peece of flint, which waie it seemeth *Luther* following held the *Consubstantiation*. Others thought that the bread was gon & corrupted. Others, that the substance of bread was changed into the substance of Christs bodie which waie *Innocentius* followed refusing the other two, although no fewer miracles (he should say grosse absurdities & contrarieties in nature) naie more, seeme to bee builded vpon the opinion which hee did chuse, then one the other which hee refused. For before that time it was left free to euerie man to thinke as himselfe liked. Now for the *antiquitie & credit* of this Lateran counsell, wee may consult with *Andradius*, the late defender of the Tridētine counsell, and as great a Doctor in his time as *Bellarmine* is now, and therfore his testimonie may not bee denied; In order it was the ninth generall, for place it was held in the pallace Lateran in Rome, for time it was held in the yeare of our Lord 1215. twelue hundred & odd yeares after Christ. It was called together (saith he) rather to amend the ill manners, that then raigned, then to decree anie matters of faith, nether did they much trouble thēselues, to expoūd any hard places of scripture or open anie mysteries, such good heed was taken to establish so high a point. Thus hauing the receipt, you maie distill the water, I meane hauing these things brought to your hands so plainly, you maie learne those two points of wisdome, so much spoken of, *Be sober & distrustfull*. Let *Plato* bee your freind, Let *Aristotle* bee your freind; but the truth, let it be more your freind; for he that betraieth the truth, betraieth his owne soule.

L. 1. fol. 46. de verit. corpor. & sang.

3. Opinions touching the substantiation

Defenc. Trid. conc. l. 2. f. 427. Genebrard. Chro. l. 4. fol. 955. rekoneth it for the 12. generall, so doth Bellar. l. 1 c. 5. de conc. & eccles.

Amicus Plato amicus Aristoteles, magis amica veritas.

I craue no more of you but that you examine both doc-

trines, before you yeeld your free assent to either, if you haue meanie way in suspision either for my iudgment in concluding against them, that I peruert their meaning, or that I trecherously abuse their texts, I wil if you wil, take the paines, to shew you every quotation, & make your selfe iudge in both.

Tub. I thanke you for your free & open offer. It were hard to suspect him who yeeldeth such libertie, I wil at my further leasure repaire vnto you, for such of them as I shall thinke, I may most directly charge them with al.

Rom. You cānot chuse amisse chuse where you wil, they be all true and not one of them, but maketh against them, in one point or other. Al bewraying the weaknes of that cause, which that it might be quite ouerthrowen, lacketh but to be throughly sifted by wise and iudicious men, such as woulde but try and examine, it must not bee those who thinke it a tempting of God to read or heare any thinge, that shal make against them. And as I haue giuē you testimonie of their dealing in this point of the sacrament, so if you wil but harken to that more, which I shall deliuer I will shew you, that in other things as in that, they deale absurdly, confusedly, weakly, & doe euen goe from their owne grounds, & although like thēselues in all, yet not like such as they would make the world beleeue they are. And will verie clearlie & plainly proue vnto you (without sending you to their quotations when they cannot be found, as they doe in most they doe (that it is onely true against them, which they plead against vs, that there are with them, *no principles but those of Protagoras* which was, *that that should be true which euery one would allow, and that there is no rule amongst thē, but the leaden Lesbian rule which will turne euerie way.*

Iesuita Torrēsis in epistō. dedicator. in conf. August.

And becaus I wil giue you as little breath as I can, I will begin with the Iesuite himselfe first, who so chargeth vs, and other proue his ground false, and his tongue too too lauish, or else his freinds verie vnfreindly towards him, who wil not let his word stand, but disanull it, and make it of no force. In

the

the preface of that worke of his, which hee hath intituled *S. Augustines confessios* (as though al that he had there laid down were indeed *S. Augustines* both for the bookes named, and the questions handled) hee hath wonderfully praised that ancient father (as indeed hee did deserue verie much in the Church of God) euen so much that (to draw it into a breefe) he saith, what soeuer *S. Augustine* doth deliuer, was not the doctrine or teaching of any one prouince or kingdome alone, but the vniuersall consent and approbation of the whole catholike Church; and which did not continue allowed for the space of three or foure hundred yeares, but hath bin receiued & stood firme in the world these thousand yeares. Hee was, (saith he) a sincere and true witnesse of the Catholike faith, beyond al exception, & one that did not only deliuer, what was his owne iudgment in anie thinge; But what was his, was also the common consent of the ancient fathers, & Apostolike Church, and who was free from partiallitie touching either part in what soeuer he wrot.

Iesuit vt ante. Praises giuen to S. Augustine by the Iesuite.

Omni exceptione maiorem, & qui non de sua tantum sed & de communi antiquorū patrum & Apostolicæ ecclesiæ constanti ac stabili confessione nos bona fide reddat certiores.

The Church had a Pastor and Bishop of him, in the dexteritie of whose wit posteritie did wonder, at the soundnes of his doctrine, at his knowledge in the holy scripture, at his subtiltie in disputing, at his constancie in maintaining, at his wisdome in iudging, at his holinesse in liuinge, at his singular faith & industrie in accomplishing. In the end he admonisheth his reader to repaire to S. *Augustines* bookes, as to the fountaine, and draw from him the confession of the true faith and Catholike Doctrine. Be it vnto *Torrensis* & al those, that so loue *S. Augustine*, as he hath said; I wil say nothing now to the cōtrary. More you see cānot be said of the mā. But what if these very men, who so much praise him now in a generallitie in a good mood, doe when they are vrged with his opinion in a particuler point of doctrine, with the same breath blow hot, and cold; are these men not like our common slanderers in these daies, that hold nō man for honest, any longer then he pleaseth them, when indeed the more a man doth

please them, the more dishoneste he is, which consisteth only in following their brutish and beastly affections, no more sauouring of Christianitie the their stables and dogge kennels doe of Ciuet or perfume. An instance against the Iesuite I will giue presently. S. *Paul* writing vnto the *Corinthians*, speaking of the Iewes in the time of the law, saith *they did eate the same spirituall meate, and did drinke of the same spirituall drinke for they dranke of the spirituall rocke that followed them and the rocke was Christ.* Now the question is, whether S. *Paule* meant, they dranke of it, amongst themselues, or, that they and wee had one in common betweene vs, which is Christ. We say that the Iewish sacramets were in effect & substance all one with ours, and that the spiritual meat of theirs, was Christ the *Messias to be crucified*, the outward signes differ *they had Manna*, and we the *bread of the Eucharist, which is plainly* S. *Paules* drift in that place; & not to speak of what they had amoge themselues, but only that they & we had one Christ in diuers different signes.

1. Cor. 10. 1. 2. 3. verse. The same spiritual meat.

The Iewish sacraments and ours in substance al one.

Annot. 1. cor. 10. verse. 3.

The Rhemists offended at this, yet knowing not how to amend themselues but by railing (for quotations should not haue wanted, if they could haue told where to haue founde them) doe saie *that it is an impudent forgery of the Caluinists to write vpon that place, that the Iewes receaued no lesse the truth and substance of Christ and his benefits in their figures, or sacraments, then we doe in ours: and that they and we eate, and drinke of the self same meate and drinke, the Apostles saying only that they amonge themselues did all feed of one bread & drinke of one rocke.* This say they, turning the Apostles wordes and meaning, to a cleane contrarie sense. But how shal it be knowen (besides the text of S. *Paule*) who interpret that place truly, they or we.

The Iewes among themselues did all eate of one spiritual meat.

The Rhemists name not one ancient father, who interpreteth that text as they doe.

First you see they haue not so much as named anie anciēt father, who may bee imagined to leane towards them, which is one manifest argument there is none, nether vndoubtedly is there any, for considering their intollerable ambition in other parts of that booke, how they *tally* vp fathers by skores, when

when they can but pretēd their names, they would not now haue omitted them, if they could haue told which of them, did but looke that way. Now for our parts, vvee can name & doe daily read, in the volumes of that great Doctor so much renowned by the *Iesuite* euen S. *Augustine*, that he doth interpret that place as we doe. For after he hath recited the text of S. *Paule*, he saith, *verilie the same spirituall meate, but the corporall was other, because they did eate Manna, and wee an other thinge.* Where are the Rhemists now, & where is *Torrensis*, & where are they al? Hath shame and grace so left them that they are past blushing. *Perisse mores, ius, decus, pietas, fides, & qui redire, eum perit, nescit pudor.* All right religion honestie good maner, yea and that which knoweth not how to returne when it is once gone, *shamfastnesse*, are cleare cassired by them, euen as though the safest way to stop one mischiefe were to fall into many enormities. This is so cleare out of S. *Augustine*, that those diuines amongst them, who gathered the booke of sermons, & homilies set out by the decree of the Trent fathers, doe charg S. *Augustine* in that point, with a *violent interpretation*. Which is both an iniurie to that ancient father, & deeply ingrosseth the Rhemists amongst them who thinke that bookes will not blush, what soeuer faces will, and assureth vs that our interpretation is true and consonant to S. *Paules* meaning, and the Papists in generall are ouerthrowen in that whole question. For if the ancient Iewes could and did eate the same Christ that we doe; & that the same substance was in the Israelits sacraments that is in ours, and that a good Iew is a good christian; It must needs follow, that we eate him no more really & substantially in our sacraments, then they did in theirs, and for them to haue him really and substantially in theirs, 2000. yeares before he was incarnate was impossible, therfore nether haue we him so. I could shew this matter more largly out of S. *Augustine*, if I would stād about it. It sufficeth me, first to haue found *Torrensis* so praising S. *Augustine* as I haue set down, then the Rhemists most shamelesly denying

Super Ioan. tract. 26.

Senec. in Agal. act. 2.

Per celera iā. per tutum est sceleribus iter.

Opera Laurētij cum dij Itali, & post obitū eius à Francisco Gerardo Molano Lugd. anno 1588. in tercio tomo f. 279. violenta interpretatio ponitur in margine eiusdem libri.

ing our interpretation, & lastly S. *Augustine* charged by thē with vsing a violent interpretation in the holie scripture, and that in that interpretatiō he is ours: *Bellarmine* himselfe hādling that question giueth ouer S. *Augustine*, plainly by name, & saith he wil preferre *Chrisostome* before him in that. Where is *Torrensis* now, who said, that S. *Augustines* iudgment, is the iudgment of the whole Church, & that his witnesse is without exception? Doth not this plainly shew that *they will allow of nothinge, no further then it shal make for thē? Doe not they shew that they haue no rule but the Leaden Lesbian* as *Torrensis* calleth it? Doth not *Gregory Martin* chide the Protestants in general for following S. *Augustine*, in reading a text of Scripture as he doth, and saith they followe him against all antiquitie? Why? if *Torrensis* say true, he is as good as al antiquity. For his testimonie is the testimony of al antiquity.

Bella. de effec. sacram. l. 2. c. 17. fere fine.

In his discouerie of our translations. c. 19.

De eccles. hier. l. 3. c. 4. fol. 153 & c. 5. fol. 163

Albertus Pighius, an other great, but late procter for the Church of Rome, imputeth as much infamy to S. *Augustine*, as euer *Torrensis* did vertue & as much in constancie, and perplexitie in change of doctrine, as euer the other did constancie. *Augustine* (saith he) was constant in nothinge, but what did please him now, did anone displease him. And this is, because S. *Augustine* is against them, in expounding Christ to be the rocke vpon which the Church is builte, and not vpon *Peters* person as *Pighius* and the Papists would haue him say, Mary *D. Stapleton* censureth that verie fault in S. *Augustine* somwhat modestly, caling it *lapsus humanus*, an ouersight proceeding of ignorance. Yea *Torrensis* himselfe doth gnaw at S. *Augustine* for so interpreting that place, of Christ; & not of *Peter*; although hee will not much defile that neast, which he tooke such paines to beautifie; *D. Allen* & *Melchior Canus* doth both confesse S. *Augustine* to be ours in an high point of difference betweene them and vs, and namely in expoūding the words of the Prophet *Malachy* (*From the rising of the sunne to the going downe of the same my name is greate amonge the Gentiles, and in euerie place incense shalbe offered vnto my name,*

D. Augustinus varius & incōstance in scriptu rarum expositione. Mat. 16. Doctrin princip. l. 6. c. 3. Vt ante. fo. 82. 83. Allen. vt ante l. 2. c. 5. fol. 517 Mel. Can. vt ant. l. 12. c. 12. fol. 411. The prophesy of Melchy. c. 1. 11. for the calling of the gētiles and what manner of sacrifice they should offer.

and

and a pure offering, for my name is great amonge the heathen saith the Lord) of the sacrifice of praise and thankes giuinge, as wee doe, & therfore not of the sacrifice of the Masse, as they doe. And thus doth S. *Augustine* by their owne confession stande with vs against them, in the most principall differences betweene vs and them. Now I doubt not the later Masters wil rather condemne the Iesuits fraud, for commending him, whom they doe not loue, rather then at that composition, giue ouer the questions which he holdeth with vs, wholy into our hands: But though they doe abate their Iesuits credit we wil yet hold the questions in despite of their cunnings, to wrest the veritie of them from vs. But leauing them mired in these, I wil proceed to other things, to see if they be there any cleenlier.

There is a great question betweene them and vs, whether generall counsels, gathered together for the benefit of the Church to appease questions that arise therin, touching matters not only of life, but of doctrine and faith also, may not can erre. They affirme that touching matters of fact, ceremonies, or things belonging to discipline or manners, that such a councell may erre in such things, but not in concluding matters of doctrine. On the contrary side, wee hold (in few wordes) that they may erre in all, hauing no more assurance from aboue, for the one then for the other. For confirmation of which our position we alledge S. *Augustine*, who speaking both of the priuate writings of Bishops and of councells, held in particular regions, and of generall counsells gathered of the Christian world saith *Etipa concilia quæ per singulas regiones vel prouincias fiunt, plenariorum conciliorum auctoritati quæ fiunt vt vniuerso orbe christiano sine vllis ambagibus cedere.* And euē those counsells which are held in euerie region or prouince, without al doubt must giue place to generall counsells, which are gathered of all the christian world, *and that oftentimes the generall counsells themselues, are often corrected the former by the later*, when by any triall of things, that is opened which was shutt vp.

Of generall councells.

Tō. 6. de bapt. con. Donat. l. 2. c. 3.

vp, and that is knowen which was hid, without any swelling of sacrilegious pride, without any stiffe necke of arrogancy, without any contention of malitious enuy, with holy humilitie, with catholike peace, with Christian charitie. Here wee haue a plaine place, that only the holy scripture cannot erre, that all other writers may erre, that all prouinciall counsells may erre; and last of al, generall councells themselues may be corrected, the former by the later, therfore without question they may erre. They agree with vs in this text of S. *Augustine* but the meaning of the words (notwithstanding they be very plaine) they doe deny, framing the text to as many fashions, as possible they may. They seeme by their answers vterly vnacquainted with the occasion of S. *Augustines* discourse in that place, as thongh it were a very hard thinge either to see the originall, or hauing seene it, to iudge of it. But the multiplicitie and crokednesse of their shifts doth plainly shew, that the authoritie maketh against them and for vs.

Andr. defenc. cone. Trid. li. fol. 51. 53. They may be explaned or vnfolded, is the first shift.

Andradius the defender of the Tridentine counsell, saith, that S. *Augustine* seemeth to him to say no more but, that *later counsells maie with clearnesse vnfold those things, which the former had ouerslipped.* And that S. *Augustine* insinuateth so much, where hee saith, *when by triall of things that is opened which was shut vp, and is knowne which was hidden.* This glosse of *Andradius* will soone eate out the bowels of the text. S. *Augustine* saith a generall councell may be amended, & therfore corrected, which is more then to be explaned or vnfolded. And the opposition that S. *Augustine* makes between the holy scriptures, which is not to erre, & all other authorities must needs stand firme, & that must be inferred vpon generall coūcels which cannot be spoken of the scriptures, but the scriptures may be said to be vnfolded, explaned, or enlightened, but not corrected: therefore *S. Augustine* meaneth more of generall councels than so, evē plainly that they may erre. *Alphonsus a Castro*, alleadgeth this of *Augustine* by the halfe. For where S. *Augustine* saith, *and euen generall counsels are often corrected, the*

Aduersus hær. l. c. 8. fol. 17. a. Leaueth out the principall member.

former

former by the later, he breaketh it of, and saith nothing of it, & alleadgeth the former part to proue that *prouinciall councels may erre*, as though S. *Augustine* had gone no farther and not spoken of generall also. *Melchior Canus* comming to answere this place of *Austine* deviseth a new shift. That S. *Augustine* there speaketh not of any amendment in a matter of *Faith*, but of *Lawes*, which are to bee referred to things either done already, or to be done. A strange kinde of harmony these men make in opening one poore place in this ancient father. But they do herein as theeues indicted for robbery, they will confesse nothing, because they know they are guilty, but must haue all things proued against thē. He speaketh plainely of the question of *Rebaptization*, as by and by I will declare when I come to *Bellarmine*.

3. Locor. Theol. l. 5. fol. 185. b. ad 10. Non videtur loqui de emēdatione fidei sed legum.

The Rhemists glaūce at this text of *Austine*, in their notes on the new testament, and do therein exceedingly giue the world to vnderstand, that when they compiled that worke they aimed only to vphold falsehood, and not to open anie truth. But as *Tully* said of falshood in oaths, *Fraus dispergit non dissoluit periurium*. Deceipt bindeth but doth not discharge the oath, so let them huddle & shuffle, cloake & hide, glose and doe what they will, the text of *Augustine* is open for all men, and there may they most be discouered: *He speaketh (say they) of circumstances accidentall which require alteration and not of essentiall points of doctrine when he saith the former generall or plenary counsells, may be amended by the later: quasi matrimonio habent dotatum Augustinum*. As though S. *Augustine* were giue to them in marriage, and all men else shut from him, and so they vse him. The Iesuite *Bellarmine* according to the manner of his answering commeth in with two or three *forsos*, peraduenture he speaketh of this, & peraduenture he speaketh of that, and yet neuer hitteth the right peradventure.

4. Annot. in 15. Acts v. 13. of accidentall & changable things. Tull. offic. 3.

Quasi matrimonio habet dotatam rempublicam. Cicero Octauio.

Bellar. de con. author. l. 2. c. 7. fol. 119. Why cannot Bellarmine tell wherof S. Aug. speaketh.

To the authoritie I answere, first, (saith he) Perhaps S. *Augustine* speaketh of *vnlawfull councells* which are amended by others after that are lawfull, as it hapned to the 2 Ephesine

6. counsel, which was amended in the Chalcedon. Secondly, if he spake of lawfull counsels, then (saith hee) hee speaketh of matters of fact, and not of right, in such kind of questions it is out of doubt, that a cõsel maie erre, for the principal questiõ of the Catholike with the Donatists, was about one *Caecilianus* whether hee had deliuered the scriptures into the handes of the heretikes, or not? And it may bee aunswered by a thirde waie (saith he) if our aduersaries contend. That S. *Augustine* speaketh generally of al questions when he saith *That former councells may be amended by later*, that then he speaketh of precepts of *maners*, and not of questions of *Faith*, for precepts are changed according to *times*, *places* & *persons*, and those changings are called *amendings*, not that the thinge was before ill, but that it began to bee ill the circumstances being changed. And both these answeres are confirmed by the words of *Augustine*, when he saith that then *Counsells* are amended, when by some experience that is opened which was hid, questions of matters of fact, or of maners, & not al questiõ of right are opened by experiment. Thus far *Bellarmine* wherin I cannot chuse but maruaile at his grosse and poore shiftes in a case so plaine, so taken, so knowen of all men. What deuises? What impostures? What weakenesse hath he shewed in his ghesses? As though hee had neuer seene nor read the place. Doth S. *Augustine* speake of vnlawfull counsels? Doth hee speake of deliuering ouer the books of holy scriptures to the heretiks? doth he speak of matters of fact? Doth he speake of precepts of maners? Or doth he speak of all of these? Or of any one of these? Neither of any one of these doth he speake, nor of all of these. But because it appeareth by these ghessing answers of theirs, that the cõtrouersie would sone be at an end, if the occasiõ which drew those words frõ him, were rightly & truly deliuered, because al mẽ agree *Intelligentia dictorum ex causa est assumendi dicendi*. The vnderstãding & true sence of words must bee fetched, from the occasion that gaue the speech: which was this. In that ancient father S. *Cyprians* time a coũ-

De questionibus facti non iuris.

Apolog. Thes. Rey. de sacra. scrip. fol. 215.

sell

fell was held in Carthage, *Cyprian* being president therof, wherin was concluded *an error* of faith *that such were to be rebaptized*, as had bin baptized by heretikes. The Donatists vrged that decree together with S. *Cyprians* authoritie, against S. *Augustine*, S. *Augustine* as he refused the opinion (holding no rebaptization although heretikes had baptised) and the authoritie too, answering *that only the scriptures could not erre, but all other both Bishops writings, prouincial counsells, yea & generall too might erre, and therfore bee amended.* And this is plainly to be seene both in the first chapter of the first booke, where he saith he will diligently handle that question of *Baptisme* in the bookes following, which elswhere he had omitted, & proue it too against all those, *qui non studio partium cæcati iudicant*, who iudge not according to parts taken. And also in the first chapter of the third booke, where hee reciteth the verie state of the questiō, which he was to handle against the Donatists, and that decree which was vrged, wherin was concluded *that al heretikes & schismatikes*, that is to say, *all that are out of the fellowship of the Church, haue no baptisme, and therfore whosoeuer being baptized came from them to the church, were to bee baptized againe.*

Aug. de bapt. contra Donat. l. 1. c. 1. & lib. 2. c. 1.

Vnpossible it is that either the Rhemistes, or *Bellarmine*, or any other writer amongst them, should be ignorāt of this. But when malice shadoweth mens minds they doe verie really lay open themselues. Hardly can any of them saie, that this question of *Baptisme* was a matter of fact, & not of faith, or of maners and not of doctrine, vvhē it is of so high a point as *baptisme by heretikes*, whether we ought to baptize those againe, who haue by them bin baptised first. He that mistrusteth what I haue said herein, let him ether read S. *Augustine*; & that shall best resolue him, or the learned writers of our age, *D. Fulkes* second daies conference in the Tower with *Campian*. And in his answere to the Rhemists. 1 5. *acts.* v. 13. *D. Whitakers* in his tract of counsells against *Bellarmine*, set out since his death, Or *D. Reynolds* in his Apology of his Thesis, and

Confer. in the tower 2. day. Annot. in 15. act. v. 13. Prælect. Whitak. cont. Bell. de con. q. 6. f. 318.

Apol. thes. Io. Rey. de sacra. scrip. fol. 225. Whitak. cont. Dureum. l. 4. de conc. f. 291. Bellarm. testifieth against himselfe. that S. Aug. spake against rebaptisation, which I hope hee will not say is a matter of fact. Bellar de. cōc. auth. l. 2. c. 3. f. 111. & de cōc. & eccles. l. 1. c. 10. fol. 46. 47.

Whitakers against *Dureus*, all which doe mightily discouer the folly of their adversaries in this point. Compare their concord in this question with the inconstancie of those on the other side. But see the high impudencie of *Bellarmine* against the witnesse of his owne conscience, and against al the excuses, and deuises before set downe, to darken the place in question. He doth scarsly full foure leaues before, say plainly, in praise of generall counsells, That S. *Augustine* did excuse *Cyprian frō heresie*, only because at that time there had bin no generall counsell held, *quo definiri potuisset questio illa de baptismo hereticorum*. Wherin that question of the baptisme of heretikes, might haue bin defined, & quoteth *Aug. lib. 1. de bapt. c. 18.* And could *Bellarmine* tel that in the first booke & 18. Chapter *Augustine* spake of baptisme by heretikes, and that that was the Donatists case, and his; They alleadging, and he excusing S. *Cyprian*, & could hee not tel that it was the same which *Augustine* spake of, in the 2. booke and third chapter being the place in questiō with vs: but foure chapters of? But wee may thanke the truth for *Bellarmines* confession against himselfe, as *Tully* said of it, *O magna vis veritatis, quæ contra hominum ingenia, calliditatem, sollertiam, contraq; fictas omnium insidias, facile se per seipsam defendat.* O the great strength of the truth, which will easily defend it selfe, against the wits, craft, suttelty & all deuises of men whatsoeuer:

Tull. pro. M. Cœlio.

As before you haue seene their seuerall obseruations touching that authority of *Aug.* so wil I yet more plainly discouer their pretēded right to a Canō of a great & anciēt counsel, the first generall, held at Nice in a question betweene the bishop of Rome and vs, we saying the Canon maketh for vs and they for them. The canon goeth thus, *Mos antiquus peràuret in Ægipto, Libia & Pentapoli, vt Alexandrinus Episcopus horum omnium habeat potestatē quandoquidem & Romano Episcopo parilis est mos.* Let the ancient custome remaine throughout Egipt, Libia, and Pentapolis that the Bishop of Alexandria haue the goverment ouer al these, because the bishop of

Can. Nic. cō. 6. Iuell. reply. to Hard. art. 4. di. 7. fol. 240. Reyn conf. with Hart. c. 9. diuis. 2 f. 573. Defene. of the Apology. p. 2. c. 3. diuil. 6. fol. 114.

Rome

Rome hath the like order. Likewise also in Antiochia & in other provinces, the priuiledges are to bee kept to the churches. Which canon of the councel is acknowledged by ours, to be plaine for the purpose it was written, viz: that the Bishop of Rome, hath no soueraignty ouer other patriarches, but only a fellowship and equallity with the rest, to walke carefully within his owne diuision, as others were bound to do within theirs; For the councel groūded themselues *on the custome of the bishop of Rome*: that as he had preeminence of al the bishops about him, so Alexandria and Antioche should haue of al about them, and likewise other Churches (as the Metropolitan) each in their owne prouinces, doe shew, that the Pope neither had preeminence of al through the worlde before the Niceene councel, nor ought to haue greater rule (by their iudgment) than he before time had. This is the true and genuine sense and meaning of that councel and canon. The contrary part are diuided in this, and yet not diuided. Diuided touching the original text of the canō, some of thē saying it is vnperfect: And againe not diuided, in that they al claime by it, not respecting the vnperfectnes of it.

A strange sentence it were, that coulde both extol the bishop of Romes authotity ouer al churches, and yet limit him to his scantling, as wel as other bishops, and serue this turne both when it is perfect, & when it is vnperfect, & wanteth. Friar *Ecchius* in his booke of common places, doth read the canon word for word as we do, without any adding or diminution. So doth D. *Harding* in his confutation of the Apology of the church of England. *Sanders* in his visible monarchy, doth fowre times iut vpon this sixt canon, evē as we read it, without any addition in words, saying a sinister interpretation sometime. *Andradius* confesseth the canon as before it is read, and yet he hammereth fowly about it, bringing in instead of, *because the bishop of Rome hath the like order or custome*, these wordes; *because the Metropolitane hath the like custome*. And so instead of the bishop of Rome, he readeth the Me-

Ekius ench. de loc. cō. f. 98. Hard. in conf. Apol. p. 2. c. 3. diuis. 6. f. 114. Saūd. de visib. monar. lib. 7. fol. 220, 228, 288. 332. Stapler. ret. of vnt. against Iuell. art. 4. fol. 38. b. Andrad. defe. Trid. conc. l. 2. fol. 234.

1. Instead of the Bishop of Rome, he readeth Metropolitane.

tropolitane. Mary this was out of an old Latine coppy which he standeth not much vpon, because the canon it selfe was written in Greeke. But saith he, where the Niceene synod speaketh of the like custome to the church of Rome, yet doth not make equal the church of Alexādria to the church of Rome, but confirmeth the prerogatiue of the church of of *Alexandria to the iudgement of the church of Rome*, and saith it is the custome of the Church of Rome, that the Church of *Alexandria* should bee taken for the primate of Egipt. What? by the iudgment of the church of Rome? as though the Church of Rome allotted it to be so. To take *his iudgment*, for his *Custome* were an hard interpretation, & flat against the text, for both their limits are grounded vpon old customes, and not one vpon the others iudgment. *Dureus* goeth more exactly to worke and setteth downe the canon in Greeke and Latine, even as we read it without alteration: But addeth that nothing coulde haue beene spoken more plaine & cleare, for establishing the authority of the church of Rome, ouer *all churches*: For those fathers (saith he), bring the custome of the church of Rome for an argument wherby they limit the authority of the bishop of *Alexandria*, & therfore the church of *Alexandria* dependeth on the Church of Rome as on a mother, and receiueth all shee hath from her.

a. He expoundeth his custome to be his iudgment.

Dureus conf. resp. Whitak. rat. 4. fol. 170.

Which glosse of his, is the farthest frō the text that may be imagined, his exposition standeth thus, *Let the bishop of Alexandria gouerne the Churches of Egipt and the rest of the Metropolitanes in their provinces doe the like because the bishop of Rome hath iurisdiction over all churches*, what coherence, hath one part with an other? If the bishop of Rome had power over al, why did not those fathers expresse that they bestowed his charge vpon others, & that with some dependency on him? And how is it, that they themselues tel vs, that the churches founded by S. *Peter* and namely *Antioche* and *Alexandria*, haue bin named the chiefe patriarchal churches, and did goe be-

Dureus exposition.

Panssoote. fo. 91.

Antioche & Alexandria were cheefe patriarchall churches.

before al the others in the counsels? Hardly then can *Dureus* vel vs, when *Alexandria* depended on Rome as on a mother? But *Dureus* saith further that we might learne the meaning of the canon, from *Paschasinus* the Popes Legate in the counsel of Chalcedon, where he recited that sixt canon thus, *Trecentorum decem & octo patrum sextus canon quod Ecclesia Romana semper habuit primatum*. The sixt canon of the 318. fathers, that the church of Rome hath alwaies had the primacy. Wel may this be the preface of the Popes Legate, before he came to the Canon, but the canon it could not be in cõmon sense and reason; But *Dureus* hath broken the Ise & set in his foot and *Bellarmine* must finish the rest. This of *Paschasinus, but the church of Rome hath alwaies had the primacie* was spokē by him 120. yeares after the canon was made, and yet *Bellarmine* is come to this, that those words should be the beginning of the canon, and that the canon wanted a beginning til nowe of late, where it is plaine that those were but the Legates words in fauour of the sea of Rome and no part of their meaning.

The Church of Rome hath alwaies had the primacy.

Fowre several times doth *Bellarmine* assay this canon to make it serue his turne. In the first, hee alloweth the canon only as we read it, without claiming any addition to it. In the second hee handleth it roughly, but yet confesseth against himselfe, that as the canon is extant in the cõmon prints, the beginning lacketh, which is, *Ecclesia Romana semper habuit primatum, mos autē perduret*. The church of Rome hath alwaies had the primacie, let the ancient custome remaine, &c. For so (saith he) did *Paschasinus* read it in the counsel of *Chalcedō*: If it be so, then doth *Dureus* abuse his reader, for he saith, *Paschasinus* read it thus, *The sixt canon of the 318. fathers, That the church of Rome hath, &c.* why doth *Bellarmine* suppresse the word *That*? but to make vs Beleeue, the recital of the canon, is the canon it selfe. But *Bellarmine* doth freely confesse that the ancient father *Ruffinus* for more than 1200. yeares since, expounded the canons as we do, that is; That the bi-

1. Bellar. de Rom. pont. l. 1. c. 24. fol. 151. 2. l. 2. c. 13. fol. 221. 3. l. 2. c. 17. fol. 250. 4. l. 2. c. 18. fol. 266.

The Church of Rome hath alwaies had the primacy. Ruffinus expounded the canon as we doe.

shop

shop of *Alexandria* should haue the care of all Egypt; as the Bishop of Rome hath of the Churches neere about him. But *Bellarmine* saith that this expositiō is false, as also that of *Theodoret Balsamon* a greeke borne, who doth also to that effect interpret the Canon; who, howsoeuer hee displeaseth them now, yet doth *Alan Cope* confesse him to bee a learned diuine. But that exposition amongst many that pleaseth *Bellarmine* best is, That the bishop of *Alexandria* should gouerne those prouinces allotted to him, because the bishop of Rōe is so accustomed, that is, because the bishop of Rome before any definition of any councell did accustome, to permitt the gouernment of Egypt, Libia, and Pentapolis to the Bishop of Alexandria, or was accustomed to gouerne those prouinces by the bishop of Alexandria. *Iacerent in tenebris omnia nisi literarum lumen accesserit* saith *Tully*; All things had lien buried in darkenesse, had not the light of good letters awaked them. How doe these men, with the knowledge of good letters; involue all things into more darkenesse, then if they were reduced to the first *Chaos*? There is none of them al but knowe, that the canon about which they keepe so much stirre is directly against them. The verie recitall of it, is a sufficient confutation of the argumēts brought to the contrarie. They only desire to force their witts to vphold their willes. If the beginning of the canon hath bin wanting so long time as *Bellarmine* maketh account it hath, how did *Eckius*, *Harding*, *Saunders*, *Andradius*, and *Durens*, make it serue their turne against vs when it was wanting? are they so good workmē that any tooles wil serue their turnes, whether they bee blunt or sharp, wil any thinge against the Protestants serue? But popery was neuer fully cloathed in all hir colours til the late Iesuits set it to sale. How or by whose means that peece was wāting so long, or how it came to be wanting, or how to be foūd *Bellarmine* doth not shew. What record maketh mention of it ether counsell or father, or Doctor, or whoeuer said so but he, he is taken with, maner, and vntill he doth manfully acquite him-

Cope dial. 1. f. 165.

Oratio pro Murena.

himselfe, he must stād charged with the wrong don to those 318. fathers, whose words he hath falcified, If hee bringe out an other Iesuite, elder then himselfe to testifie with him; it may not serue, the intelligence shalbee but as betweene an incendiarie and a robber, the one to fire the house and the other to rifle it There was a time when the shewing of this canon (if it doe make for the bishop of Romes authoritie) wold haun greatly pleasured the Roman bishops, namely in their great and longe conflict with the Bishops of *Aphrica*, even touching superioritie and command, during the full time almost of three Popes *Zozomen*, *Bonifacius*, & *Innocentius* 1. presently after the *Nicene counsell*, who contended with them & denied it them. Then or neuer had that canon beene to bee shewed, had it bin at all, and fitter oportunitie to haue found it was neuer offered, But none of the Bishops of Rome', euer hard of the making of it, which is an vndoubted argument there was none such, On the other side wee haue testimonie both for the Canon, ever since it was made, that it was neuer altered, and beside the evidence of the truth in the verie language of it, we haue *Ruffinus* for 1200. yeares agoe, expounding of it, as wee doe.

But let vs compare their new patch, with the whole cloth, and see whether that that should fill it vp, do not take from the garment, and so the breach be worse; *Let the ancient customs be kept thorough out Egipt, Lybia, and Pentapolis, that the bishop of Alexandria haue the goverment of all these, for the bishop of Rome hath the like order. Likewise also in Antiochia and in other provinces the priviledges are to be kept to the churches.* After their forgery we may read it thus. *The fixt canon of the* 318. fathers *That the church of Rome hath alwaies had the primacie, let the ancient customes remaine, &c.* After *Bellarmine* thus. *The church of Rome hath alwaies had the primacie, let the auncient customes remaine thorough out Egipt, Libia, and Pentapolis that the bishop of Alexandria governe these provinces, because the bishop of Rome is accustomed so to do; that is because the bishop before the definition*

Mat 9.16. Contraria inter se apposita magis elucescunt.

The right canon as they all agree.

Dureus vt ante

Bellar. vt ante

of any councell accustomed to permit the gouernment of Egipt, Libia, and Pentapolis to the bishop of Alexandria; or accustomed to gouerne those prouinces by the bishop of Alexandria. Hauing this liberty to do and say what they list, to adde or take away whē they wil, they were to bee reckoned as simple and childlike, as now they are found fraudulent, and base; if they would euer yeeld to any authority, that is alleadged against them. But yet they shal not loose their labors, it shal be with them as with the *Grecian* artificers *eos aulædos esse, qui citharœdi fieri non potuerint.* Who were taken to be pipers when they coulde not attaine to be good plaiers on the harpe; and they shal be accounted Coblers and botchers, for faire and good worke they set vp none. I could cloy you with proofe against them in this kind of dealing, but I wil only adde one or two more, and so an end.

Cicero pro L. Muræna. orat. 13. fol. 750.

The ancient father and martyr S. *Cyprian* who liued aboue 1300. yeares agoe within 250. yeares of Christ, hath this sentence, *Hoc erant vtiq; & cæteri Apostoli quod fuit & Petrus, pari consortio præditi & honoris & potestatis.* Verily the rest of the Apostles were the same that *Peter* was, indued with like fellowship both of honor and power. From which the Protestants argue that S. *Cyprian* knew no rule or dominion that S. *Peter* had ouer the rest of the Apostles, for saith he they were equal both in honor and in power: and so hath shut out the bishop of Rome from hauing that soueraignty over the rest of the bishops of the church. Bishop *Iuell* in his time without any mistrust, thought this authority of *Cypriās* strōg enough (amongst others) to shew the ancient fathers mindes in that point, *Gratian* who compiled the decrees, hath recorded this sentence of *Cyprian*, even in this forme that we lay it downe: Cardinal *Caietane* citeth it twise in two seueral tracts writing of the Popes authority, even as we do without any addition at al to it.

Antwerpiæ excudebat Ioannes Crinitus. anno. 1541. Cypr. de simp. prælat siue de vnit. eccles. Al the Apostles were equall.

Iuel con Hard. art. 4. diuis. 6. fol. 239. Caus. 24. q. 1. Ioquitur dominus. Caiet. de rom. pont. instit. tō. 1. tract. 3. c. 3. & de author papæ & conc. tō. 1. tract. 1. c. 2.

Saunders also in his visible monarchy argueth vpon this text of *Cyprian* for *Peters* supremacie over the rest of the Apo-

Saund. l. 7. nū. 46. fol. 262.

poſtles, but quoteth the text as we do, without the late addition added by the Ieſuits; ſo that for our warrant wee haue al the ancient texts of *Cyprian*. The decrees of *Gratian*, the teſtimony of *Caietane*, and the allowance of *Sanders*. Nothwithſtanding which teſtimony & witnes, they haue of late found out a piece belonging to this text of *Cyprian*, which ſhall not only contrary the true reading, but even palpably & groſſie cauſe him to confound & overthrow his own former words. They read it thus, *Hoc erant vtiq; & cæteri Apoſtoli quod fuit Petrus pari conſortio præditi, & honoris & poteſtatis, ſed exordium ab vnitate proficiſcitur, & Primatus Petro datur, vt Eccleſia vna monſtretur*. The reſt of the Apoſtles were the ſame that *Peter* was, indued with like fellowſhip both of honor & power, but the beginning cõmeth from vnity, *And the primacy is given to Peter*, that the Church might be ſhewed to be one. *Et primatus Petro datur*, and the primacy is giuen to *Peter*, hath been added vnto *Cypriã* of late becuſe they ſaw the former words did quite overthrow them, and ſo in adding them they haue overthrowne vs and *Cyprian* too. Wil they haue any man to thinke that S. *Cyprian* would ſay firſt. The reſt of the Apoſtles were the ſame that *Peter* was, indued with like fellowſhip both of honor and power; and to adde preſently, *And the primacie is given to Peter*. How were they the ſame? how were they indued with like fellowſhip both of honor and power, if *Peter* had the *Primacie*? Vnleſſe ſuch a primacy be ment, as notwithſtanding wil leaue them the ſame that he was, & ſo the ſame, that they ſhall be like in honor and power: ſuch a primacy I hope they haue wit enough to diſcard, and yet any other primacy ſhall contrary *Cyprian*, and proue them forgers.

Bellar. de rem. pont. l. 1. c. 12. fol. 103. lege & lib. 4. c. 23. fol. 591.

Et primatus Petro datur & the primacy is giuen to Peter is added to Cyprian by the

They are Maſters of the preſſes beyond the ſeas, they cõpaſſe ſea & land to make a proſelite, they ſpare no coſt, ſhal we think that if the auncięt manuſcripts of *Cyprians* text, had had that clauſe, that the firſt printed copies would haue wãted it? Would *Gratian* haue omitted it, in his decrees or *Caietane*

Dial. dial. 1. f. 123. Rhem: annot. Ioh. c. 21. f. 280 Dureus. rat. 6. fol. 286. Fulk against the Rhem. Io. Io citato. Rey. cõf. with Hart. c. 5. diuis. 2. fol. 165. Whit. cõt. Dur. l. 6. fol. 433.

ietawe or *Saunders*, not haue seene the very words, that should point out the supremacy, it is hard so to thinke, & against former experiences. And yet doth *Alane Cope* in his dialogues, The Rhemists in their testament, *Durem* against *Whitakers*, in defence of *Campian*, al which go along in that stringe, and holde in that addition, but most crookedly in so straight a cause. Doth not this iustifie the complaint of our mẽ against them, who lay it soundly to their charge, that they from beyonde the seas haue twenty such deuises as these, to make their religion go currant, among their novices here in England? You haue seene in the former examples of the Nicene counsel, and S. *Cyprians* authority, how bold (without shame) they haue bin to adde vnto their texts, that which the original bookes had not; Nowe will I shew you with how great shew of diligence, they can handle other authorities when they do but seeme to make for them. The thing is this. The Ecclesiastical histories of *Socrates* & *Sozomene*, do make mẽtion of certaine troubles, that befel vnto *Athanasius*, *Paulus*, and *Marcellus*, *Asclepas* and *Lucius*, al Archbishops of great places in the East, who being expulsed from their churches, fled vnto Rome where *Iulius* was bishop, who bestirred himselfe as wel as the time would giue him leaue, to see them restored to their seas, if possible it might be. This authority & record seeming to make for the bishop of Romes power and dominion, is garnished with glorious titles, and often alledged with great pompe, as if the matter were cleare, and to be receiued without further examination, that the bishoppe of Rome had supreme power on earth over all other bishops.

Eccles. histor. Socrat. l. 2. c. 11. & Sozom. l. 3. c. 7.

Bellar. de rom. pont. l. 2. c. 15. fol. 237.

Bellarmine alleadgeth it fowre seuerall times, vnder fowre seueral titles, and in al fowre agreeth with himselfe; That *Athanasius* & the rest being deposed frõ their seas fly to Rome, where *Iulius* for the dignity of his place, geue them comfort and reliefe, and in plaine termes restored thẽ to their bishopricks. First he alleadgeth it in the Chapter of proofes for the Popes monarchy, by the witnesse of *Greeke* fathers: because

1. By the witnesse of Greek fathers.

the

the historian *Sozomene* who reporteth it, was a Grecia. Next, for the authority which the bishop of Rome exercised, over other bishops, because hee wrote to the Easterne bishops about them. Then in the chapter of appeales, because they came from the East into the West for succour. In the fourth place, he bringeth it in for the Popes authority over counsels, because the Easterne bishops had deposed the other in a coūcell. It is a signe that *Bellarmine* would play the good husband with the whole peece, that can doe so much with such smal rags. The first reporter of this is *Socrates* a Greeke writer, aswel as *Sozomene* & before him in the history; He sheweth how that *Athanasius*, *Paulus*, *Asclepas*, *Marcellus*, and *Lucius* being depriued of their churches came to Rome the princely citty, and certifie *Iulius* of their troubles; *Iulius* by reason of the prerogatiue of his church vphelde their partes, writing his letters into the East, which they trusting vnto, go euery man to his owne home, and send the letters according to their seueral directions. But those of the East tooke the letters of *Iulius* in skorne, & wil not be directed by him. After this the Emperour *Constans* writeth to his brother, in the behalfe of them, desiring him to send those thither, who might render a reason before him of the iust causes of their deposition. His letters tooke none effecte, in so much that they make humble suit that an other counsel might bee called, wherin both parties might be the better known. By the commandement of both Emperours a general counsell was proclaimed at Sardice a citty of *Illirium*: by the better part of the counsel is *Paulus Athanasius* and *Marcellus* restored to their bishopricks. Notwithstanding these things, *Constantius* the Emperour of the East deferred from day to day, the execution of his brothers request concerning the deposed bishops, wherefore he gaue him in choise, either to restore *Paulus* and *Athanasius*, and so accompt him for his friend, or else to heare the proclamation of open warre and so finde him as his deadly foe. The letters he sent were to this effect. Them re-

2. Bell. vt ante. l. 2. c. 18. by his authority ouer other bishops.

3. Bell. vt ante l. 2 c. 21. by appeales made vnto him.

4. Bel. de cone. auth. l. 2. c. 17.

The first reporter of this is Socrates Eccles. histor. l. 2. c. 11.

You shall read before that they fled to Constantinus the younger, l. 2. c. 2.

Loco contumeliæ.

Cap. 14.

Constans Emperour of the West.

Cap. 16.

Edicitur concilium generale, idq; de sententia duorū Imperatorum.

Constantius Emperour of the East.

Cap. 18.

The letters of conſtauce, to his brother Conſtantius.

remaine with me Athanaſius and Paulus who as I am credibly giuē to vnderſtand are perſecuted for godlineſſe ſake; If thou wilt promiſe me to reſtore them to their ſeates, & to puniſh ſeuerely ſuch as haue iniured them; I wil ſend the parties themſelues vnto thee; But if thou wilt not accompliſh theſe things as I require; I will that thou knowe, that I will come thither, and whether thou wilt or no, reſtore them to their ſeats. Conſtantius vnderſtanding this, aſſembled many of the Eaſterne biſhops and demanded of them what were beſt to be done. They anſwere, it were farre better to reſtore *Athanaſius*, than to raiſe deadly and mortal warre. Wherefore the Emperor reſtored *Athanaſius*, *Paulus*, *Marcellus*, *Aſclepas* and *Lucius*, every one to his biſhoprick againe, ſo that by the Emperours edict they all receiued their own ſeas, the cities were commanded to entertaine them, with willing & cheerful mindes. Thus much briefly out of *Socrates* concerning the troubles which befel on *Athanaſius* & the reſt of the Catholike biſhops.

They did not cōclud thus vp on the Biſhop of Romes. letters.

In fine epiſtolæ Iulij Romani epiſcop. ad clerum & populum Alexandrinum.

What *Sozomene* reporteth (which is all the ſhew that *Bellarmine* hath) of this matter, ſhal as breefly follow as the reſt is gone before. In his third booke & ſeauenth Chap. he mētioneth the ſame matter that *Socrates* did, in his ſecond book & eleuenth Chap. That is the flight of *Athanaſius* & others from Alexandria and other places, to Rome, *Iulius* his writing letters in their behalfe, which he calleth *his reſtoring of thē* (euen as in an other place he ſaith they depoſed *Pope Iulius*, who yet was not depoſed) Their anſwering of *Julius* letters rethorically and ironically, telling him withal, that although Rome from the beginning had bin famous and the Metropolies for religion & godlines *tamē authores religionis Chriſtianæ primū, ex Oriēte eò veniſſēt* yet the auhors & foūders of the chriſtiā religiō came firſt out of the Eaſt thither, & that *Iulius* in doing that which he did, had brokē the laws of the church in medling with thoſe that they had dealt againſt. In the meane time new accuſations were coined vnto *Conſtantius*, which *Iulius* vnderſtanding thought it not ſafe for *Athanaſi-*

Sozomene of the ſame matter. l. 3. c. 7.

His reports of this ſame matter.

Chriſtian religiō came firſt out of the eaſt

ue to like in Egipt, but sent for him to Rome; And wrote a- Cap. 8. & 9.
gaine to the bishops of the East, who met at Antioche replying to the letters, and found fault with them that contrary to the faith of the Nicene counsel they had vndertaken new matters, and contrary to the lawes of the church, they had not called him to the counsel: For saith he, there is a law belonging to the honor of Priesthood, which taketh those acts for voide, which are enacted without the consent of the bishop of Rome, the matter commeth to this issue, when *Iulius* Cap. 19.
saw that those things for which he wrote tooke none effect, *causam Athanasij & paulı ad Constantem refulit*, hee bringeth the cause of *Athanasius* and *Paulus* vnto the Emperour *Constans*, who did write vnto his brother both for the sending of *Athanasius* his accusers vnto him, with request (in that manner as before you did heare) to see them restored himselfe. He is the issue of what Iulius could doe. He brought the matter into the Emperours hand.

The conclusion of *Sozomens* history concerning *Athanasius* and the rest, is the same that *Socrates* (before mētioned) was, thus: *Athanasius* returned from the West vnto Egipt: so did *Paulus Marcellus Asclepas*, & *Lucius* recover their Episcopall seates, for by the Emperours letters they also had libertie to returne, to their owne home. Sozom. l. 3. cap. vlt.

There is a third historiographer who is very plentifull in reporting the troubles that befel on these bishops, and of *Athanasius* comming vnto *Constans* the Westerne Emperour, and his putting the Prince in minde of his fathers Acts, and of the great Councel of Nice, which his father had called; & then instantly got the Emperour to write vnto his brother *Constantius*, wherin he warneth him to keepe inviolably the inheritance of his fathers faith. *Constantius* moued with these letters, appointed a Counsel to be held at Sardice, & willed the bishops aswel of the East as the West to be their present. Whereby it is plaine stil, that, as the Emperour restored them in the end; so had they power to call and summon the councels, and to appoint any meane which they thought fit, for the due hearing of the matter, till their owne full sentence came. Theod. eccles. hist. l. 2. cap. 3.

came. And this is so plaine that *Sanders* in his visible monarchy saith *Magnus Athanasius nihil dubitauit Constantis Imperatoris Catholici fidem atq; opem contra Constantij Cæsaris vim ac perfidiã implorare.* *Athanasius* the great doubted not to craue and implore the trust and help, of the catholike Emperour *Constans* against the force & trecherie of the Emperour *Constantius*.

L.2.c.4.fol.82. ex Theod. eccles lib,2. c.5.

Now let the whole world iudge betweene our aduersaries & vs, which of vs twaine haue more right vnto this question of restoring of *Athanasius*, and the other Bishops. The history is plaine *Iulius* authority was to weake to performe what he thought to haue compassed, and therfore hee appealed to the Emperour, who indeed did strike the stroake. Thus is *Bellarmines* Fowre fold proofe, proued to bee single fold and poore, and yet is not this his case alone but of others before him, *Hardings*, *Dorman*, *Pighius*, *Cope*, & *Stapleton*, all of them ioining in one to suppresse the truth, & all of them alleadging the storie falsely and deceiptfully, as though it had bin done by *Iulius*, which was only effected by the Emperour. And where, in the processe of this tragedie touching *Athanasius*, I haue opened (indeed of purpose, because the aduersaries should not cauill) that *Iulius* alleadged a law in he honor of Preisthood, which ordained that those acts should be void, which were made without the consent of the bishop of Rome, which may seeme at the first sight, to make only for his authoritie and soueraignty, excluding all others, It may please them that shal so thinke to vnderstand withall, that over the bishops of Christendome there were constituted & appointed foure Patriarches of Rome, Constantinople, Antioche, and Alexandria, amongst which foure the Bishop of Rome had the first place in order and sitting, when they did meete to gether. but no definitiue sentence to vndoe that which they did, or to conclude without them, and this held touching generall counsells, and somethinge for the nominating of bishops, if need had bin, and not touching the bi-

2.2.3.4. 5.Hard.art.4. cont. Iuell. fol. 111.b.& 117.b 6.Dorm. cõt. Iuell. fol. 64.b. 7.Pighius eccles.hier.lib.4. fol.269. 8.Cope, dial.1. fol.55. 9.Staplet. returne of vntruths against M. Iuell. art. 4. fol.29.

shop

shop of Rome only but also towardes others of that fellowship, and thence sprange their letters of mutuall certificate each to others, touching that one faith which they al professed, as *Gregory* the great, seemeth to insinuate when he saith *Hinc est etiam quòd quoties in quatuor præcipuis sedibus Antistites ordinantur, quasdam sibi epistolas vicissim mittunt.* Hence it is also that oftentimes we finde that men of cheife authoritie are appointed to rule in the fowre cheife seas, & mutually they sende synodicall Epistles each to others *cum multi sint Apostoli, pro ipso tamen principatu solæ Apostolorum principis sedes in authoritate cõvaluit, quæ in tribus locis vnius est.* Although there bee many Apostles, yet for the principalitie, the seate of the prince of the Apostles was cheife in authoritie, which authoritie in 3 places is equal: For he (*Peter*) exalted the seate wherin he vouchsafeth to abide, and ende his life. Hee also beautified the seate, vnto which he set the Evãgelist (*Mark*) his disciple. And he established the seate, wherin he sate seuen yeares although he remoued from thence. And other mens consents were established by law to bee had aswell as the bishop of Rome as we may read in the same history of *Sozomene*, that the counsell holden at Ariminum was condened because *neither Vincentius nor the rest to whome it belonged aswell as the bishop of Rome* (though his minde should haue bin knowne before other) *had not agreed vnto it*. It is moreover read again in plaine termes in the diuisiõ betweene *Sisinius* and those of Cyzicum, they appointing one bishop and he nominating an other, *Hoc ab illis factum est neglecta illa lege quæ tubet nequis episcopus designetur absq; sententia & authoritate Episcopi Constantinopolis*. This they did saith the storie because they neglected that law which commandeth that no bishop be appointed, and ordained without the consente of the bishop of Constantinople: so it appeareth if the besineese concerning the whole church were handled the al their knowledges and mindes were had and knowne in it, if it concerned any particular part therof, then the particular bishops of

Gregor. l. 7. epist. 53. ex 52. diuis. mon. l. 7. fo. 358. & Stapl. Princ. fidei doct. l. 4. c. 20. fol. 349.

Greg. l. 6. epist. 37. ex Saund. visib. monar. l. 7. fol. 220.

The dignity in the 3. patriarchal seats is equall.

Rome.
Alexandria.
Antioche.

Soz. l. 6. c. 23

Sanders abuseth this place alleadging it so, as if the consent only of the bishop of Rome were required. Declaue Dauid. l. 4. fol 80.

Socrat. eccles. histo. l. 7. c. 28. Noe bishop ordained without the content of the bishop of Constantinople.

the prouince, and the patriarch yeilded thervnto & the Emperour aboue al to bridle and call all to accompt.

You shal further see their sincerity in alleadging the histories by an other exãple about the bishop of Romes supreme power, out of the ecclesiasticall historie also. The second generall counsell in their Epistle to *Damasus*, which is extant in Theodoret doe say that they came to the citty of Constãtinople *ex mandato literarum pontificis* by commandement of *the Popes letters* sent vnto them by the Emperour, And there also they confesse the church of Rome to bee the head, and they the members. This saith *Bellarmine* in his first report of that historie. In the second place, he bringeth it in for proof of the Popes authority in calling of generall counsells, Theodorete reporteth (saith he) that the Emperour *Theodosius* did not so much call the counsell at Constantinople, as that hee set the letters of *Damasus* the Pope, to the bishops, by which letters the counsell was summoned; For so write the bishops gathered together in the counsell vnto *Damasus* the Pope, *mandato inquiunt literarum superiore anno à vestra reverentia ad sanctissimum Imperatorem Theodosium missarum*. That by letters receaued the last yeare from your holynesse (meaning the Pope) sent vnto the most holy Emperour *Theodosius* wee prepared to take our iourney to Constantinople. Although therfore saith *Bellarmine Theodosius* called the counsel yet he called it by commandement of the sea Apostolike. In the 3. place hee bringeth this same example for the presidentship, and cheifty of the bishop of Rome in counsells. In the secod counsel held at Constantinople (saith hee) it is certaine that the Emperour sat not cheife, but only sent the letters of the bishop of Rome, to the rest, by which they were called to the counsell, And it is certaine (saith he) that the Romqn bishop was not president but *Nectarius* the bishop of Constantinople, the reasõ wherof is, because the bishop of Rome was not there, nor any Legate for him, for *Damasus* the Pope had called the bishops of the East to Constantinople; But from

that

1. Bellar. de Rom. pont. l. 2 c. 13. fo. 223. ex Theodoret. eccles. hist. l. 5. c. 9. is abused aswel as the rest By commandement of the Popes letters saith Bellarm. 2. Bellar. de conc. & eccles. l. 1. c. 13. f. 60. By the Popes letters they came to Constantinople. Almost impudent vntruth shamlesly avouched. 3. Bel. de conc. & eccles. l. 1. c. 19. fo. 83, & 87. The bishop of Constantinople was president. If the bishopp of Rome or his legat must needs be president of counsells; then this counsel lacked a president, or otherwise it must appeare that Nectarius was his Legat or deputy, both which are absurd to think.

that place he would haue had them come to Rome, that so *at Rome there might haue bin a full & plenary counsell both of the East & West bishops*; But if *Damasus* had beene there without doubt he had sat cheife, as appeareth by their Epistle to *Damasus*, *Vbi illi Damasum vt caput suum agnoscunt, & ipse filios eos vocat*, wherin they acknowledge him for their head, and he calleth them sonnes, so much for *Bellarmine*.

How bouldly are these vntruthes avouched?

4. Saund. l. 1. fol. 41.

Saunders in his Visible monarchy, maketh a briefe of this matter thus. The fathers that were (saith he) gathered togither, in the second general counsel holden at *Constantinople*, when they were vrged by *Damasus* the bishop of Rome to come thither, amongst other causes why they coulde not so do, brought this for one, That by the letters of the same *Damasus* written to the Emperor *Theodosius*, they were appointed only to prepare themselues for a iourney to *Constantinople*; And that they had brought the cōsents of the bishops who remained at home in their provinces with them of the celebrating of that one councel. *Sanders* againe in an other place, preambulateth from the matter before hee come to it, thus. Although the consent of the bishop of Rome alwaies had & obtained, did confirme the summoning of a general cōusell, yet that in a great matter no error should creep in, it was the order that the Pope should send his letters to the Emperour touching that matter, and then the Emperour having received those letters, did by his own letters assemble the bishops where vpon the bishops assembled at *Constantinople* do write vnto *Damasus* in these words, you did send for vs as for mēbers of your owne body, by the letters of the most holy Emperour to come vnto the counsel which is gathered togither at Rome by the wil & pleasure of God. And a little after. By the commandement of letters from your holinesse, sent the last yere vnto the Emperor *Theodosius* after the councel held at *Aquila*, wee prepared our selues only for our iourney to *Constantinople*. It therefore appeareth (saith *Sanders*) from this testimony. That there were two Councels holden at once,

By the Popes letters they came to Constantinople.

5. Sand. declaue Dauid. l. 4. fol. 81.

The cosent of the bishop of Rome.

As who should say the Pope commanded the Emperour to summon counsells.

one at Rome, the other at *Constantinople*, and to both of them the Pope sent for those bishops by the letters of the Emperour. Thus much from *Sanders* in that place of that matter.

6. Staplet. ret. of vntruths art 4. fol. 139.

D. Stapleton an other of that side, maintaining the Popes soveraignety, is no more abashed to abuse the history than those other haue done in the places going before. For saith hee, those bishops of *Constantinople* doe write vnto *Damasus* the Pope, and shewing a cause of there not cōming to Rome, do further say vnto him, *That they had assembled themselues but lately at Constantinople by the late letter of your honor sent after the counsell holden in Aquileia to the most Godly Emperour Theodosius, which was the reason why they could not come to Rome.* Now touching this present matter (saith he) the bishops here doe witnesse that to that counsel of Rome the Pope called them, *by the letters of the Emperour*, not as a warrant (they haue no such word) but rather as a meane. For they witnes he calleth thē at his *proper members*. This it the first canvasse they haue had touching this place of *Theodoret*: the seauenth set downe by *Sanders* in a third place of his booke, will quite overthrow both himselfe and them, being inlighted a little by the history, which they all haue most shamefully abused. For in this third place of his hee hath bewraied their shameful dealing. There he confesseth that the Bishops of the East, did write to other bishops of the West, and namely to *Ambrose*, aswel as to *Damasus*, & not to him alone, (as hitherto they al made vs beleeue they did) and there he confesseth more over, that the Easterne bishops receiued *a letter* from the Westerne gathered together at Rome, in which letter they were praied to come thither: and that in their answere back, they declare that *all the westerne bishoppes sent for them by letters from the most holie Emperour*. But (saith he further) it appeareth from this place, that the first beginning of a general counsel is the bishop of Rome, but the meanes which the Pope vseth in that matter *is to call them by the Emperours letters*.

Letters from your honor.

Bellar. thrise. Saund. twise already. Staplet. once. 7. Sand. de visib. monar. l. 7. fol. 312. num. 145. 146.

The whole masse of falsehood is discouered.

The Easterne bishops write to all the bishops of the West, and so the letters go in the plurall number.

This is all their report that I finde of this matter. I would

now

now but aske them this questiō *whether they tell vs thus much, because they beleeue it, or beleeue it because they tell it vs?* If they tell it vs as beleeuing it themselues, we can say no otherwise of them, than of him that did accustome to tel lies so fast to others, that in the end he tooke them for truthes himselfe: if they beleeue it because they tell it vs, our incredulity in this case shal do them good, in aduising thē not to beleeue that wee will any more take the reporte of any such matter vpon their words; so that if our deniall wil profit them, I assure thē, I will not credit them in any thing without due evidence of the iustnesse of it: And therefore I giue them the councel in the Poet *quoniam id fieri quod volunt, non potest, velint id quod possit*, since they cānot haue what they would, that they would take what they may; But they answere they would haue nothing but the Bishop of Romes supremacy, I say again as the Poet saith in that place, it were much better for thē to leaue that fansie, rather than by this palpable fraud to go about to perswade it. Al their inferences from that text of *Theodoret*, are false and merely suggested, *either of the Popes power in calling that counsell of Constantinople; or of their writing to Damasus, & onlie to Damasus, or that they called him their head, or that they confessed themselues his proper members*; as they haue abused the history.

Ter. in Eunuc. act. 2. scen. 1. Nihil aliud quam Philumenam volo.

The writing which the bishops of the East sent to them of the West, is called, *Libellus Sinodicus à Concilio Constantinopolitano ad Episcopos missus*. The Councel of *Constantinoples* declaration sent vnto the Bishops. The superscription is, *Dominis honoratissimis & cum primis reverendis fratribus ac collegis Damaso, Ambrosio, Brittoni, valeriano, Acholio, Avemio, Basilio, et cæteris sanctis Episcopis*. To the most renowned, and most especial reverend brethren and fellows *Damasus, Ambrose, Briton, Valerian, Acholius, Avemius, Basill*, and the rest of the holy bishops gathered togither in the famous citty of Rome: The holy councell of Catholike bishops gathered togither in the famous citty of *Constantinople* send health in our Lord. *Num*

The true report out of Theodorete, eccles. l. 5. c. 9.

Reverend bretheren & fellowes.

Ter. in Eunuc. act. 2. scen. 2. *quid nam hic quod nolis? vides Bellarmine?* Is there any thing here o *Bellarmine* that thou wouldest not see? Yes, neither me nor that which I haue brought. Where do they write to *Damasus*? Where do they acknowledge him the head, & they the members? Where be the letters *sent frō his hower*? All this, like religious and loving fathers to the Church of God they confesse each to other, because they consented in one catholike doctrine, & were of one Catholike church, (though diuided by East and West,) whose head is Christ as S. *Paule* Ephes. 4. 5. saith, *One Lord, one faith, one baptisme.* But if you will speake of what they were in respect of themselues, and their *authoritie* Sozo. l. 6. c. 23. ouer each other, *they were brethren and fellowes.* And this *Damasus* himselfe knew wel enough (although these men defile their consciences for him) when he and other bishops of Italy, did write vnto the bishops of *Illiricum*, *That it was meete that all the bishops belonging to the Romane iurisdiction should agree in one.* And great Marualle it were that *Damasus* should be so Qui Romani ditioni subijciuntur. suddenly growne potent, and masterfull ouer the bishops of the East, when it appeareth that *Vrsinius* durst checke with Socr. l. 4. c. 24. him for the Popedome; as *Felix* did with *Liberius* who went Sozo. l. 4. c. 14. next before him, which contention the councell of *Syrmium* determined willing them to be bishops both together.

Now touching the termes of *Father & Sonnes* which these men catch at for *Damasus* behoose; It is cleare in the letter that *Damasus* and the westerne bishops with him, do say of the Niceene councel, *that they were their fathers*, & that their Patres nostri. decrees *had armed their faith*, Fidem nostrā cinxêre. against the weapons of the Deuil. If the Popes Soueraignety had bin without limit, and ouerall; it had bin a very harsh phrase to haue named the *Romane iurisdiction* as *Damasus* and the rest do. Againe, this same coūcel held at Rome by *Damasus*, was at the same time with that other of *Constantinople*, & vnto which *Damasus* summoned and called those of the East, how came it then to passe, that both they could shift themselues from their obedience to *Damasus* and not to come; and haue their councel held at

Con-

Constantinople, whereat neither *Damasus* nor any for him was present, to be celebrated by so famous a name as *The second generall councell*, and so remaineth vnto this day, rather then that other of his at Rome, if *Damasus* were so great at that time, as they would make vs beleeue he was.

Furthermore, whereas they simper so much about *Damasus* forsooth of *Calling the councel at Constantinople*, they cannot tell whether it was done *by his advise*, or *by his authoritie*, or whether he did it at the Emperours request or the Emperor at his; or whither their powers were equal; so well haue they conned their leere, yet is it plaine by the Ecclesiastical history that the Emperour called and summoned it. *Imperator nulla mora interposita, concilium Episcoporum, ipsius fidem amplectentium, convocat.* The Emperour admitting no delay called a councell of Bishops, imbracing the same faith which he did, whereby the faith of the Niceene councel might be strengthned, and a bishop of *Constantinople* appointed. Here is no sharing of authority in this point betweene the Emperour and the bishop of Rome as *Sanders* would make vs beleeue, *vt ita Papa atq; Imperatoris convocatio vna eademq; esset*, that so the Popes summoning and the Emperours might bee but as one act.

Theodosius caled the coũsell at Constãtinople, anno. 385. Socrat. eccles. hist. l. 5. c. 8.

The Popes deede and the Emperours al one.

Ita vt prima generalis concilij causa sit Romani episcopi, hoc est, primi pastoris cõuocatio.

Search all antiquity for these 1300. yeares, ever since the first famous general councel of Nice, and neuer heare of that practise, except in some *petite-graund* councels of their own of late yeares, such as that was of *Trent*. And where also *Sanders* in the processe hereof woulde make vs beleeue, that in those times the bishop of Rome *was the first originall cause of calling councels*, but the meane whereby he effected that calling was the Emperours greatnesse by his summons, (as also *Stapleton* beareth vs in hand, in the places before cited;) is a mere abuse and absolute forgery without either sense or savor. For he telleth vs presently, as if he would purposely frustrate, al that himselfe had said, that *Leo* the great did write vnto the Emperour *Martianus* thus, *Poposceram a gloriosissima clemen-*

Moris fuit vt Papa literas de ea re ad imperatorem daret: is vero papæ literis acceptis, etiã per suas literas Episcopos convocaret.

Leo epist. 44. ex Saund. de clare Dauid. l. 4. f. 81. & de visib. mo l. 7. f. 346.

clementiã vestrã, vt synodum, quam pro stabiliendã Orientalis ecclesiæ pace à nobis etiam petitam necessariam iudicastis, aliquãtisper differri ad tempus opportunius inberetis, I desired of your most excellent Maiesty, that you would commande that that synode which you thought necessary to be holden for establishing of the peace of the East church, for which I also made suit might haue bin for a little while deferred to a more conuenient time. And this was touching the great general counsell of Chalcedon, which *Martianus* the Emperour summoned, being often moued thervnto by *Leo* the Pope, and not only summoned it, but was also present, and not only present but sat in the first place, and late so *ad confirmanda in fidem*, to confirme the faith, as before him the good Emperor *Constantine* did. And when his Maiestie was not disposed to sit any longer, hee left certaine of his secular Princes to sit in his absence. And when the counsell was ended hee willed *Leo* to direct his letters to all the bishops that were present, to signifie his consent and allowance to the Articles of faith which they had decreed, which hee willingly performed least any should take occasion to stumble through his default. If the Popes owne wil and purpose were the first & original cause of counsells, and that the Emperors duty was but to signify to the bishops, when hee had receaued order from the Pope; Then are they false that tell vs (and it is they that tel vs) that the Emperour summoned it, and that the Pope obtained so much from him by intreatie, & when the summons was gon out, his holinesse prayed it might be deferred, and could not obtaine his request. Hardly can it be said that the Emperor and Pope were equall in authoritie at this time, seeing the Pope by intreaty sought that of the Emperour, which had the matter bin as they lay it downe hee might haue compassed by his owne power without him. Let this suffice for these.

The bishop of Rome desired the Emperor to deferre the Counsell. Staplet. ad Eliza. reg. Angliæ in epist. præfixa ad Bedã. in Angl. ferm. Bellar. de cõc. & eccles. l. 1. c. 19. fol. 88 89. Leo epist. 58. ex Saund. de visib. mon. l. 7. fol. 352. Vide Stap. ref. of errours, against M. Iuel art. 4. fol. 142, 143.

The last point touching the succession of the Bishops of Rome.

Now for the last point whereof I intended to speake *Tuberius*, which was touching the succession of the bishops of Rome, for these many hundred yeares, of which you said at

the

the beginning you had a table, because I doe imagine that your table is but a bare table of names, without any touch either of the doctrine they taught, or opinion they held, or of the incertainty of the order of their places, or maner of comming into that sea, whether lawfully or vnlawfully; you shall therfore haue a tast of the weaknes of that great pillar whereō you must leane, if you wil be a Romanist. *Ex successione incertissima incertior fides.* From an vncertaine succession, is no certaine trust to bee drawen, and more wisdome were it for thē to cleare the doubts of their owne evidences then to call other in question for theirs. They cry nothing but succession, succession, as though their succession were as Davids sling & their bishops had been as so many choise stones in the scrip, which were able to coquere a mightie oppugner; but it hath rather proued like *Saul* armour buckled to David, more cūbersome then safe for *David* to weare or for any to trust vnto, *Successores omnes cupiunt esse, imitatores pauci, vtinam tam vigiles reperirentur ad curam, quam alacres currunt ad cathedram*, saith *S. Bernard*, They al desire to be the successors (of *Peter*) few to bee followers; I would they could be found to bee as watchful in the charge, as they runne willingly to the chaire. Graunt them but to sit at Rome where S. *Peter* sate, and for any beleife, doctrine, abilitie to teach, vertue, godlinesse, or almost common honesty, they care not for any. We be plainly taught saith D. *Hardinge*, that albeit the successors of *Peter* Christs Vicars in earth, be found blame worthy for evil life, yet we ought not to dissent from them in doctrine, nor sever our selues from them in faith. For as much as notwithstāding *they be evill*, by Gods prouidence for the surety of his people *they be compelled to say the good things that be good*, and to teach the truth the things they speake not being theirs but *Gods*, who hath put the doctrine of verity in the chaire or teate of veritie. Which singular grace commeth especially to the sea of *Peter*, ether of the force of Christs prayer, or in respect of place and dignity which the bishops of that sea hold from

Examine the succession vpon these points.

Bern. in cone. Rhem. f. 361. b.

Cont. Iuell. art. 4. fol. 113. 114.

The Popes be compelled to say the good things they do say.

The Popes cõpared to Balaam & Caiphas

Christ, as *Balaam* could bee brought by no meanes to curse that people whom God would to bee blessed. And *Caiphas* also prophecied, because he was high bishop for that yeare and prophecied truly, being otherwise a man most wicked. And therfore the evill doings of the bishops of Rome make no argument of discrediting of their doctrine, nether ought the evill liues of the bishops of Rome, to withdrawe vs from beleeuing and following the doctrine preached and taught in the holy church of Rome. The Rhemists will cõfesse more of their Popes, *Liberius* (saie they) in persecution might yeeld, *Marcellinus* for feare (of death) might commit Idololatrie, *Honorius* might fall into heresy, and more then all this some Iudas might creep into the *office*, yea and al this without preiudice of the office and seate. We doe say that the Pope may erre (saith *Stapleton*) and hath erred both in faith and maners touching his owne private person. Let it be true (saith he againe) that *many Popes haue forsaken the faith, yea and Christ too, because of their wicked liues* & haynous deeds. *Cornelius* bishop of Bitonto, in his oration to the holy councel of Trent, spake bitterly to this purpose, *Vtinam à religione ad superstitionem, à fide ad infidelitatem, à Christo ad Antichristum, à Deo ad Epicurum velut prorsus vnanimes non declinassent*. I would to God (saith he) that they had not altogether declined from religion to superstition, from faith to infidelity, from Christ to Antichrist, and from God to Epicurus, The penners of the late supplication to the Kings Maiestie in the behalfe of the papists could not hide this truth, that the wicked liues of several the professors, and cheife rulers of their religion, could not hetherto, nor shal not to the worlds ende, either extirpate or darken the visibilitie of their Church: & yet very wantonly in an other part therof, they say cleane cõtrary, that the professors & spredders of their religion were alwaies of a knowe holy life and semblable death.

Annot. in Luc. c. 22. v. 31. Liberius Marcellinus Honorius, They knowe wel that worse ehẽ the'e haue sat in that seat. Stapl. returne of vntruthes art. 4. f. 111. & 116. Bicont. in ora. Cone. Tridẽt. ex Duræo cõtra Whit. rat. 7. fol. 369.

Supplic. anno 1604

Wicked liues in the cheife rulers & professors of their religion.

A manifest cõtradiction in the petition.

Here haue they gained a manifest contradiction to them selues, or must confesse that by the *chiefe rulers, and professors*

of

of their religion, they do not meane the Popes. Thus much you see by their own confessiō, that in extolling their Popes in general, they wil allow thē to be Idololaters, heretikes, or men of monstrous and beastly liues, so they get but into the chaire al is wel: be they like vnto *Iudas*, *Caiphas*, or to whatsoever accursed miscreant else he is in the place they care not; as though that having once gotten thether, *he were beounde to perfect and season himselfe thorowghlie of al those vices which before he had by nature.* And so make *murder*, *adulterie*, *incest*, *coniuration*, *rapine*, *theft* and such like, no vice but a certaine disease vncurable, to follow him that shal sit there, as *Verres* friendes did cal his theft, *his disease*, as though it had bin hereditarie. And on such Popes as these doth he that gathered your table tel you, that Christ did build his church, and to them he committed his lambes and sheepe to be fedde, euen by their owne description to *foxes and wolues*, *traitors*, and *Apostataes*, for, for these many hundred yeares they haue bin no other. The first of those texts in your table viz: the 16. of *Mathew*, where it is said, *Thou art Peter and vpon this rocke I will build my Church, and the gates of hell shal not prevaile against it: And I will giue vnto thee the keies of the kingdome of heaven, &c.* is to short to reach whether you would haue it; for in the same chapter it is said by Christ to *Peter* againe, *Get thee behinde me Sathan, thou art an offence vnto mee, because thou vnderstandest not the things that are of God, but the things that are of mē.* Now because this later rebuke should nothing preiudice the former grant, but that stil S. *Peter* should alone be the *Rocke*, and *foundation* on whom the Church was built, and also haue the keyes, and consequētly the Popes from him; *Bellarmine* bestirreth himselfe earnestly and mainely, to purchase those priviledges, & yet keepe the text sound and not wronged. First therefore (he saith) that when Christ said to *Peter*, *vade post me Sathan*, Get thee behind me *Sathan*, he was not thē the *foūdatiō*, for in that place Christ did promise that, which he gaue him after his resurrection. When we obiect the other text of *Mathewe* 18.

quicquid ea vitia quæ à natura habebat eiā studio & artificio quodam malicię condiuisset. Cic. pro Cluentio. Furtum verris amici morbū appellarunt. Cic. l. 4. in verrem.

The examination of the table. Mat. 16. 18

Cap. ibid. v. 23.

De rom. pont. l. 1. c. 10. f. 90. S. Peter was not yet the foundation. Ob. Mat. 18. 18.

Sol. for al the Apoſtles, aſwel as for *Peter*, where Chriſt ſaid to them al, *whatſoeuer yee binde on earth ſhalbe bound in heaven, &c.* He anſwereth, That nothing is there giuen to the Apoſtles, but *that power only promiſed, explained, and foretold*, which the Apoſtles and their ſucceſſors ſhould afterward haue and exerciſe. We reply, if neither in that place were the keies giuen to the Apoſtles, but only promiſed, in what place then are they giuen? I anſwere (ſaith he) They are given in the twenteth and one and twentith chapters of S. *Iohns* Goſpel. Thus hath *Bellarmine* confeſſed, that whatſoeuer was promiſed in the 16. of *Mathew*, as it were to *Peter* alone, or in the 18. of *Mathew* to all the Apoſtles, was performed both to *Peter* & to them al in the 20. and 21. chapters of *Iohn*, which conceſſion & free grant, although it ouerthrow both what he would ſay elſe where, & al other his fellowes in this queſtion of *Supremacie* for the Pope: yet doth he afterward further inlarge it thus. That the Apoſtles receiued al their iuriſdiction & power immediatly from Chriſt, it appeareth from the words of Chriſt, *Iob.* 20. *As my father ſent me, ſo ſend I you*, which words, the ancient fathers *Chryſoſtome* and *Theophilact* do ſo expound that they do plainly ſay, *That the Apoſtles* were made Chriſts Vicars, yea that they did receiue the very *office and authoritie* of Chriſt, *Cyrill* addeth vpon this texte, That the Apoſtles, were properly erected Apoſtles and teachers of the whole world, and that we ſhould vnderſtand that in the Apoſtolike authority al eccleſiaſtical *power* was cõtained, therfore Chriſt did adde, *As my father ſent me*, ſurely the father ſent his ſon indued with ful power. Where you ſee that the ſame thing is giuen to the Apoſtles by thoſe words I ſend you, which was promiſed to *Peter* by thoſe I wil giue thee the keies, & was afterward ſhewed by thoſe, feede my ſheepe. Thus farre *Bellarmine*, by whoſe teſtimony and grant it appeareth, that the reſt of the Apoſtles had as much power in the Church, or ouer the Church, as S. *Peter* had, and conſequently other biſhops in their ſeueral places, wil haue as much as the Pope e-

Reply. Ibid. c. 12. fol. 103. Whatſoeuer was promiſed to Peter in the 16. Matth. was performed to all in the 20 & 21. of Iohn.

Bellar. de Roman. pont. l. 4. c. 23. The Apoſtles had their authority from Chriſt even the ſame that hee had of his father.

ven by thoſe places of ſcriptures, which they would challendge to make moſt for them. Thus much I thought good to ſhew you touching the glorious title of your table. Now for the order. The firſt is S. *Peter*, *Linus*, *Cletus*, *Clemens*, *Anacletus*, *Euariſtus*, *Alexander*, *Sixtus*, *Teleſphorus*, *Higinus*, *Pius*, *Anicetus*, *Soter*, *Eleutherius*, which is the fourteenth in number. By the hiſtories and moſt ancient fathers, this ſucceſſion is at firſt diſordered and interrupted. *Clemens*, ſaith that S. *Peter* when death did draw neere appointed the Romane Biſhopricke vnto him, *Dorotheus*, (as *Bellarmine* alſo telleth vs) doth place *Linus* next after S. *Peter*, & yet *Damaſus* who was biſhop of Rome, and wrote thereof, ſaith that *Linus* died before S. *Peter*. *Tertullian* placeth *Clemens* after S. *Peter*, and ſo doth S. *Ierome*. *Optatus*, and S. *Auguſtine* put *Linus* next *Peter* and *Clemens* in the third place; *S. Auguſtine* mentioneth not *Cletus* at all, but vtterly diſcardeth him: ſo doth *Optatus*, *Epiphanius* readeth them thus *Peter*, *Linus*, *Cletus*, *Clemens*, *Ireneus*, who is ancienter then any of thoſe before, both leaueth out *Cletus*, and bringeth *Clemens* after *Anacletus*. It appeareth further by *Ireneus* & *Euſebius*, that they tooke S. *Peter* no more for a biſhop of Rome thē S. *Paul*. The church of Rome (ſay they) was found by the *two moſt glorious Apoſtles Peter* & *paule*; and ſo in his catalogue reckoneth them: And thē how doe you reconcile your table to *Ireneus*, who maketh *Eleutherius* to bee the 12. but if you take in S. *Peter* for one, and *Cletus* for an other, you then make *Eleutherius* the 14. which is gaine ſaid by *Ireneus*, in whoſe time *Eleutherius* liued, and whom by name he calleth the twelfe. To cōfirme this truth the Rhemiſts themſelues confeſſe, that the Church of Rome was founded by S. *Peter*, and S. *Paule*. And further they tell vs that *Prudentius* the chriſtian Poet calleth them both *Principes Apoſtolorum* princes of the Apoſtles, giuing that title equally to them both: and they themſelues call them *the two*

The order of their ſucceſſiō. Stapl. returne of vntruths. art. 1. fol. 12. b. calleth Alexāder the 5. pope after Peter. & here he is the 7.

L. 7. conſiſt. A. poſt. c. 46. ex Bellar. de Rō. pont. l. 2. c. 4. f. 192. 193. 195.

Damaſus in Pontificiale.

Tertullian.

Ierome.

Optatus.

Auguſtine.

Epiphanius.

Ireneus l. 3. c. 3.

Euſeb. eccleſ. hiſt. l. 3. c. 4. & 2. & l. 4. c. 1. & l. 5. c. 6. & Bell. de Rom. pont. l. 2. c. 15. & l. 1. c. 27.

Vterq; Apoſtolus Romanam eccleſiam fūdauit et gubernauit.

Annot. 2. Gala. v. 7. fol. 509.

In their table and notes at the end of the

Acts of the Apoſtles, & Bellarm. de Rom. pont. l. 3. c. 4. fol. 192. Sanders de viſib. mon. l. 7. 222. 223. 224.

Peter & Paule founded the church at Rome.

principall Apoſtles, and the two cheiſe Apoſtles. The like appeareth alſo from *Epiphanius* that ancient father, who ſaith *In Roma fuerunt primi Petrus & Paulus Apoſtoli, ijdem & Epiſcopi.* In Rome were the two *Cheiſe* Apoſtles *Peter* & *Paule*, and they were biſhops alſo, *Cyrillus* alſo calleth them *Præſides eccleſiæ*, Preſidents of the church. And touching his biſhoplike reſidence there 25. yeares, as they ſay hee ſate, they are faine to extenuate the time, becauſe he was ſeldome found there, & ſay *he was often abſent frõ the cittie.* Thus it appeareth that the Church of Rome was founded aſwell by S. *Paule* as S. *Peter*, and that he had the title of *Principall, Cheiſe*, & *Firſt* Apoſtle as well as *Peter*. Thus much from an *eſſay* of the order of the first 12. But touching the men, we confeſſe them all good & godly martyrs for 300. yeaers together, to the nũber of 30, or there about, although *Marcellinus* in the perſecution vnder the Tirant *Dioclesian* did for feare of death offer ſacrifice to Idols, yet repenting he died a Martyr. Sone vpon this, it pleaſed almighty God to ſend eaſe to his Church in making her chiefe enemies, her deareſt friends, Then began Kings to be her nurſing fathers, & Queenes to be her nurſing mothers. Then firſt called he *Conſtantinus* ſurnamed the *Great* to the knowledge of the truth, of a Pagan becõming a Chriſtian, putting downe Idololatry, and erecting the true ſervice of God. Vnder him and his ſonnes there liued the Romane Biſhops *Melchiades, Silveſter, Marcus, Iulius, Liberius*, and *Felix*. There is much ſtrife in the church of Rome at this day, about this *Felix*, ſome of them reakoning him for a Pope and ſome putting him out. *Albertus Pighius* ſaith, they that regiſter him for a Pope bewray their own ignorance. *Bellarmine* ſaith, their church worſhippeth him as Pope and Martyr. The ſtrife betweene them two about *Felix*, groweth about *Liberius*, who was Pope next before him; This *Liberius* in his baniſhment vnder *Conſtantius* the Emperour did ſubſcribe to the *Arrian* hereſy, and ſo in his abſence out of the Citty, *Felix* was Pope in his roome. Thus much doth *Bellar-*

S. Peter often abſent.

The firſt 300. they were all martyrs.

Play. 49. v. 23. After the firſt 300. yeeres.

Strife about Felix. Eccleſ. hier. l. 4 c. 8.

Bell. de Rom. pont. li 4. c. 9. fol. 509.

mine

mine cõfesse of *Liberius*. And because *Pighius* most impudẽtly denieth that he subscribed, therefore he shutteth out *Felix* from being Pope at all. D. *Genebrard* cannot tel what to say directly on this *Felix* part. First he telleth vs that *Ammianus Marcellinus* in his Chronicles did passe by him as suspected of heresie, and *Onuphrius* (one that wished as wel to the sea of Rome, as wel might be) maketh him a schismatike, and an vnlawful Pope, for *Liberius* over liued him, & obtained the place alone. But other more truer (saith he) do report that he was Martired in a tumult by the *Arrians*. And yet in the next words he saith that *Felix* was appointed by *Acatius* the disciple of *Eusebius* into the place of *Liberius*, and held for an *Arian*. But such was the force of the Chaire, that it would rather hold a Martyr Pope, than an heretike Pope, or one that should favor the heretikes. Thus farre *Genebrard*. *Alphonsus à Castro*, maketh no question, but that *Liberius* was an *Arrian* heretike. *Andradius* is content that we should cal him *vnconstant, faithlesse, or vniust, but in no case an heretike*. *Fasciculus Temporũ*, saith he was the first infamous Pope. If you desire more of these two Popes *Liberius* and *Felix*, read or cause to bee read vnto you *Platina* who wrote the liues of the Popes, and *Onuphrius* annotations on him; and *Anastatius Bibliothecarius* on the same argument, set out by thẽselues not aboue three yeeres since: and you shal see diversity enough.

Chron. l. 3. fol. 574.
Ammianus Marcellinus Comes.
So was Marcellinus martired, yet he fell before.
They were wont to tell vs that Christ praied for Peter, but nowe they tel vs, he praied for the chaire he sitteth on.
Contra hær. l. 1. c. 4.
Defen. Conc. Trid. li. 2. fol. 244.
Fasc. Tempor. in liberio.
Platina in liberio. Annot. Onuphrij.
Anast. Bibl. in Lib. & Feli.
About the yere of our Lord. 370.
A schisme at Rome between Damasus & Vrsinus.
Polid. Verg. de inven. rerũ li. 5. c. 4. f. 401.
Bellar. de cle-

After those followed *Damasus*, *Siricius*, *Anastasius*, *Innocentius*, *Zosimus*, *Bonifacius*, *Celestinus*, *Sixtus* 3. and *Leo* the great. There was a schisme then in the Church of Rome, betweene *Damasus* and one *Vrsinus* or *Vrcisianus*, but *Damasus* obtained, yet not without bloud. *Siricius* was the first that in the west parts forbad priests to marry, as *Polidore Virgil* alleadgeth out of *Gratian*, whervnto *Bellarmine* is now fairely come, *That it is not forbidden by the law of God that Priests should marry*. *Innocentius* the first, held and taught a dangerous errour, that is, That it is necessary to salvation for infants to receiue the cõ-

ric, l. 1. c. 18. f. 92. Aug. epist 93. & l. 2. ad Bonif. cont. 2. epist. Pelag. c. 4.

inu-

munion, contrary to Saint Paules rule, that none ſhould receiue, but thoſe that are able to examine themſelues, and contrary to the doctrine of the Church of Rome vnder *Pius quartus* in the *Tridentine* counſell which accurſeth thoſe that thinke the Eucharift is to bee given to infantes before the yeares of diſcretion; ſo that the Apoſtolicall ſeate, in one of theſe two muſt needs er. In *Sozimus*, *Bonifacius*, & *Celeſtinus* time there was much cõtrouerſie betweene the & the Aphrican biſhops touching appeales to Rome. *Sozimus* began the claime, and could not make it good, he graced himſelfe with warrant from the Nicene councell, which beeing demanded no canon, nor decree could be ſhewed. The Aphricã biſhops deny their appeales thither, and ſo grew much turmoile. But if all Churches in al caſes were ſubiect to the ſea of Rome *iure diuino* by Gods law, as they would make vs beleeue now, very ſimple was *Sozimus* to claime by the Canons of the counſel of Nice; and very forgetful of their duties were the Aphrican biſhops who would put him to proue his authoritie by an humane invention, when the high God had by his lawes ſubiected them vnto him before, *Leo* the great, yet was his authoritie ſo ſmal, that hee could not remoue Abbat *Eutiches* from him, but was forced to intreate the Empreſſe *Puleberia* to vſe her authoritie therin. By this time there had bin fowre ſchiſmes in the church of Rome, yet *Genebrard* acknowledged but three. After *Leo*, were *Hilarius*, *Simplicianus*, *Felix* 3. *Gelaſius*, *Anaſtaſius* 2. *Simmachus*, *Hormiſda*, *Iohn* 1. *Felix* 4. *Bonifacius* 2. *Iohn* 2. *Agapetus*, *Siluerius*, *Vigilius*, *Pelagius*, *Iohn* 3, *Benedictus*, *Pelagius*, 2. *Gregory* the greate, & theſe reacheth downe to the firſt 600. yeares, Amongſt which *Gelaſius* decreed that to miniſter the holy communiõ in one kind is open ſacriledge and againe he defined that the ſubſtance of bread and wine remaine after conſecratiõ, both which are diametrally oppoſite to the doctrine of the new church of Rome. *Anaſtaſius* the ſecond was an heretike as appeareth by the hiſtories, *Wernerus* ſaith he was the 2. infamous Pope hee

Beſſ. 21. can. 4. The biſhops of Rome contended with the biſhops of Aphrica for ſuperiority.

Bonifacius 1. was the ſonne of Iucundus a Preiſt as ſaith Platina. ſo was Felix 3 who immediatly followed, ſonne vnto Felix a Prieſt.

Leo epiſt. 45. Faſciculus tẽp Geneb. in Chron. l 3. fol. 600. Eularius againſt Bonifacius an. 423.

Gelaſius was the ſonne of a biſhop called Valerius. Plat. in vit. eius.

The firſt 600. yeares.

Gelaſius decreed in 2. maine points againſt them now.

Anaſtaſius 2. an heretike.

he was a Nestorian heretike as before him his predecessor *Liberius* was an Arrian, *Vigilius* wrought meanes with the Empresse *Theodora* for the remouing of his predecessor *Silverius* out of the Popedome promising her, if shee would help him therto, to cal home *Anthemius* the heretike, whom *Agapetus* had banished, and so as *Bellarmine* saith, hee plaied the Catholike at Rome and the heretike abroad, for when hee had obtained by most vnlawfull meanes what he sought for, hee kept no promise with her, by whose procuremēt he cāe into the seat: and in effect aunswered as the fore-sworne men in times past were wont. *Iuraui lingua, mentem iniuratam gero.* I sweare with my tongue, but I meant otherwise. A very Machivellian resolution. But since *Vigilius* came in by this indirect meanes, I demand with what face *Bellarmine* can make *successiō* of bishops in that sea, *an eminēt note* of the truechurch. Al that come not in by lawfull succession and ordination are *theeues* and *robbers*. And succession takes no place, but either when bishops die, or are *lawfully deposed*: For the pope cannot be deposed by any *coactiue power* ether Eeclesiastial or ciuill which conclusions inevitably proue that *Vigilius* succeeded vnlawfully; *Siluerius* being nether *dead* nor *lawfully desposed*. And as *Bellarmine* saith, the pride and ambition of *Vigilius* droue him into those straights of periurie & shifts which hee vsed; so hath *Bellarmines* bad cause coloured with clenly words, made him gaine say in one place, what hee affirmeth in an other, which hee cannot doe, since there are so many eies to looke on, but he shalbe discouered. *Gregory* the great being the last of those I named last, vtterly denied the *name of vniuersall bishoppe*, and prainly said *Saint Peter was neuer called vniuersall Apostle*: yet *Bellarmine* reackoneth it amongst the titles of his holynesse, and the title *vniversall bishoppe* tō be the 15. in number. Howsoeuer D. *Stapleton* not so soveraigne for the Pope as *Bellarmine*, saith plainely *we cal not the Pope vniversall bishop*. The Pope writeth not himselfe so but *servum servorum dei*, the servant of Gods servants. But what

Vigilius vsed indirect means to attaine to the Popedōe. Huius Vigilij ingressus parum legitimus fuit, cum præter ecclesiasticas regulas prædecessore suo Silverio viuente, & Pōtificatus administratione submoto, per vim Pontificatum Romanū occuparit. Onuph. annot. on Plat. in vit. Vigilij.

Agapetus and Sylverius, were both Preists sonns. Denotis eccles l 4. c. 8.

Bell. ibidē 303. & 304.

Ibid fol. 306.

Bell. de Rom. pont. l. 2. c. 26. & de conc. & eccles. l. 2 c. 18.

Gregory the Great.

Bellar de Rō. pont l. 2. c. 31. fol. 324.

Stap. ret. of vntruths against Miuell, art. 4. fol. 6.

what would he practise if he might? I leaue that to M. Doctors secret discussing. Thus haue you *Tuberius* a tast of your succession and manners of Popes for the first sixe hundred yeares. In none of the Popes of the first three hundred yeres appeared any stomacke towards other churches abroad saue in *Victor*, who was next to *Eleutherius*, who shewed himselfe earliest in excommunicating the Churches of *Asia* for not keeping the feast of Easter according to the maner of Rome: But he was sharply rebuked for attempting it, especially by *Irenæus* bishop of Lions in Fraunce, in the name of the rest of the brethren there, who would not yeeld vnto him. After *Constantines* time downe to *Gregory* the great, I deny not, but men they were tollerable enough, saving for a little ambitiō creeping in amongst them. And because men are denominated vertuous, whose good gifts are many, and faults not too great, they may go al in the number of good men, euen till *Gregorie*, who may be said to be the last of the good, and first of the bad. And of all these passed I will say in respect of thē that follow after as noble S^r. *Phillip Sidney* was wont to say of Captaines and leaders in the warres, when complainte had bin made to him of some of them, *Let vs loue him for his small vertues for a number haue none at all*. And so is it with those former Popes in respect of those that followed after, onlie here and there one *religious* amongst a number of miscreants as one *Rescius* now and thē inriching a whole rable of counterfeits: For intrusions into the sea, heresie, witchcraft, murder, adulteries, and such like, Rome was the *Sentina* a sinke of sinnes, a lake of all lewdnesse, which euer yeeldeth perpetual vapours of pernitious and execrable villanies. God do so and more to me, if I report them otherwise than their owne histories record. After *Gregorie* the great followed *Sabinianus*, *Bonifacius* 3. *Bonifacius* 4. *Deus dedit*. *Bonifacius* 5. & *Honorius the first*. *Sabinianus* hated his predecessor *Gregory*, insomuch that he burned al his bookes, he did not any good worthy of memory. This is the 3. infamous Pope, as the Papists

Victor repro. ued by Irenæus Euseb eccles. history l. 5. c. 23. 24.

Sr Roger Williams reporte in his breefe discourse of warre. pag. a.

Geneb. chro. l. 3 fol. 664. Fasc. tempor. Platina in vita Sabi.

pists themselues confesse who liued a bad life and died a fearful death. After *Sabinianus* came *Bonifacius*, 3. who obtained of the Emperour *Phocas* to be called *vniuersall bishop, and head of all churches*, about which time, when the fury of Mahumet had prevailed against the churches in the East, the bishop of Romes authority increased in Europe. And the mistery of iniquity having before wrought did then shew it selfe. And this Phocas who gaue that title to the bishop of Rome, was he, that trecherously slew his Master *Mauricius*, to make himselfe way to the Empire, *& postea multa scelera addidit*, and after that, he cõmitted many mischeifes else. And in the end for his reward he was vntimely slaine according to that saying, *Omnis q̃ acceperit gladiũ, gladio peribit*. Whosoever slaieth with the sword, shal perish with the sword. And the reason why *Phocas* gratified the bishop of Rome with such a title was, because vpõ the slaughter of his Mr *Mauricius*, he feared the fal of Italy frõ the Empire, & that by the Popes means, he might keepe the West in safty. Touching *Honorius* 1. it is notoriously knowen that he was an heretike condemned by generall councells and witnesse of diuerse ancients both Greeks & Latins. They that are disposed to read of him or his cause may consult with *Andradius def. Trid. conc. l. 2. fol. 244. Canus. loc. theol. lib. 6. fol. 213. Pighius eccles. hie. l. 4. c. 8. Bellarm. de Rom. pont. lib. 4. c. 11.* And amongst vs D. *Reynolds* in his conference with *Hart. cap. 7. diuis. 2. fol. 237.* but especially his defence of his *Theses* in latine where hee hath answered *Bellarmine* and *Cæsar Baronius*, in whatsoever they could say for the clearing of *Honorius*. Now from this *Honorius* downwards towards vs the schismes and contentions began a pace: After *Iohn* 5. whoe was Pope about the yeare 687. there grew a schisme betweene one *Peter*, and one *Theodorus*, who was created Pope, and yet both of them were expelled and *Conon* whom your table calleth *Cuno*, or if you wil *Zeno*, succeeded. After these followed *Gregory* 2. *Gregory* 3. *Genebrard* putteth it vpõ *Gregory* 3. that it was he who excommunicated the Emperor

Carion. in chro l. 4. f. 568. & l. 3. fol. 369. The first setting of Mahumets foot in Arabia was whe the Empire began to bee deuided by the bishop of Rõe meanes, vide Fascicu. temp. anno. 614. Honorius amonothelite, heretike, who held that christ had but one wil. Geneb. Chro. l. 3. fol. 675. ea est vis cathedræ vt cogat bona & vera dicere, nõ bona facientes, neq; vera sentientes nec sua docere sed aliena permittit. Apolog. thesiũ Ioan. Reyn. de sacra. scrip. & eccles. a pag. 351. vsq; ad finem. Anno. 687. Geneb. chro. l. 3. fol. 698. Genebr. ibid. fo. 708.

Leo for hereſie, as he calleth it; But *Faſciculus temporum* ſaith it was *Gregory* 2, that accurſed the Emperour *Leo* for diſtroying of Images: and that the other *Gregory* got them approued in a counſell. Next after them was Pope *Zacharie*, whoe gaue the kidgdome of France frō *Childricke* vnto *Pepine*. And here appeareth the iniquity of that time, when that moſt famous kingdome of France was tranſlated from the right heires to ſtrangers. Then followed *Stephan* 2. who brought the Empire from the Greekes to the French: Then *Stephan* 3. *Paulus* 1. *Stephan* 4. But *Faſciculus temporum* and *Genebrard* place one *Conſtantine* 2. next after *Paule*, who of a lay man became Pope, invading the ſea by tyranny: who was throwen out againe, after hee had ſate aboue a yeare in the ſea. And this is the fift infamous Pope amongſt ſo many that had paſſed before, and ſo hath the holy ghoſt preſerued that ſeat in *honor and holyneſſe* ſaith *Wernerus*. And even ſo I heard a Gētleman praiſing his ſeruant who was departed from him, to be *an honeſt man*, and *an honeſt fellowe* with iteration againe & againe, when he knew he had liued in his ſeruice, a blaſphemer, a ſwearer, a common drunkard, & a moſt beaſtly lecher and one at whoſe mouth no truth could be hard: But as that Gentleman, ſeemed not to thinke ſufficiently what honeſty was, nether in himſelfe not in any other, whē he would giue ſo reverend a name, to ſo vicious a perſon: ſo did not *Wernerus* care what he ſaid of *honor and holyneſſe* when he confeſſed ſo monſtrous a wretch to haue bin Pope.

The Emperor Leo excommunicated and depriued for deſtroying of Images. Geneb. ibid. f. 720. Hee firſt abſolued the french from their oath to Childericke. Faſc. temp. an. 741. Ipſe etiam tranſtulit imperiū a Græcis ad francos. Geneb l 3. fol. 729. Wernerus in faſc. temp. anno 764. If the diuell ſhould ſit there, I thinke they would ſay the holy ghoſt preſerued the ſeate in honor & holyneſſe.

Then was there 2 ſchiſmes one betweene *Theophilatte* & *Paulus*, and an other betweene *Philip* and this ſame bad *Conſtantine*. which *Philip* being choſen by the whole church did ſit one yeare and more, and yet your table hath not that *Cōſtantine* nor *Philipp*, nether doth *Genebrard* nor *Saunders* reckon ether of them for Popes, but paſſe from *Paulus* to *Stephanus* 3. or 4. they know not which comming downe to the 800. y. and vpwards I find *Paſchalis* 1. *Eugenius* 2, betweene whome and one *Siſinius* there was a ſchiſme. *Wernerus* reac-

Cœlū vndiq; & vndiq; pōtus nothing now but ſtormes & ſchiſmes. Anno 800. Geneb. l. 4 f. 771. a°. 814. By this time there had byn 20 ſchiſmes in the Church.

koneth

koneth it for the eight that had bin in that church & *Genebrard* for the tēth, After *Engen.* were *Valentius Gregorie 4. Sergius 2. Leo 4.* & *Ione* the woman Pope, which your table hath not, nor do your late chronologers reckō hir, although they bestir themselues very fowly to cleare their own stories. For if they be mē of their words, they wil hold them to this, that the stories that make mētiō of her, were not of our deuising, for they say that our religion came from *Luther* and *Calvin*, and was never heard of before their times, who were certain hundreds of yeares after, the bringers of that matter to light were dead, and therefore they must be Catholikes at least, who write of it; but their labour in this is like the clensing of a sinke, the more they stir the more they stinke: And with wise men, the more frivolons excuses are heaped to cleare a matter in questiō, the more wil they stick to heare the truth. But what saith *Genebrard*? *Post leonem quartum recentiores, præsertim hæretici, nominant quendam Ioannem, 8. &c.* After *Leo* the 4. (saith he) the later writers, especially the heretiks, do bring in one *Iohn.* 8. or as *Sabellicus* saith 7. an English woman, or as other say of *Magunce* who in a counterfeit kinde, sate a yere and more, some two yeare, *nam mendacium non sibi constat*, for a lie abideth not by it selfe. This report of his owne, he conuinceth by these vncertainties. First (saith he) shee is saide to be the 7. & of some 8. Of some an English woman, of others a Moguntine, of some shee is said to sit one yeere and more, of others 2. yeres and more. It seemeth by *Genebrards* quarrelling about these circumstances, hee is much afraide that the matter will be proued. But al this storme wil light on *Genebrards* owne head. Turne his booke blindfold, & you shall finde some variety for the time, or country of many his own vndoubted Popes, which his chronicles can never make euen. For not many pages before he bringeth in *Gregory 4. ali. as Leo 4* and by and by againe, *Leo 4.* or 5. he knoweth not which. But *Genebrardiam quic quid id est, vel sine causa, vel sera times*, whatsoeuer you feare in this matter either it is without

Dame Ione about the yeare 855.

Geneb. l. 4. fol. 779.

Is it true, mendacium non sibi constat? & it is as true which Lactantius saith valet vi sua veritas. truth will ouercome by right tenure? lib. 5. c. 13. Omnis in vile caput hoc abeat procella. Senec. in Theis. act. 5.

eause or too late. The beast is recorded. And where hee further accumulateth errours vpon her in saying shee is called *Anglicus* an English woman or *Moguntinus*, of Maguncе in *Germanie*, malice bred that which his wit wil not proue: Admitting a doubt that stories should vary, what country woman shee was, what saith he to his own *Innocentius* 1. was he not *Albanus sive Scotus*, one of *Alba* in *Italie* or a Scot. And *Celestinus* or *Celestus*, *Campanus sive vt alij volunt Romanus*, one of Campania or a Roman. And of *Bonifacius* 6. whether he were a *Tuscane* or a *Romane*, he knoweth not; for the time he sate, *magna contentio inter scriptores*, there is saith hee great contention amongst the writers. After a few cavils more hee cõmeth to this vpshot which is a good bragge but no proofe *valeant igitur qui à viles ungas de quadam statua fœmina & sede stercoraria inclitant*. God speed them wel (or let them be packing, or let them perish and fare ill) who bragge of their olde wiues tales, and of the sitting stoole, and of the Image of the image of the woman which they say is yet to bee seene: and so indeed *valeant qui inter nos dissidium volunt* (as the younge man in the Poet to which perhaps *Genebrard* alluded) saie I. God speede them well that woulde set diuorce betweene the truth and vs in this case. I will leaue *Genebrard* and come to *Saunders*, who nothinge so shamlesse as the other but of a farre more ingenious and yeelding nature in this point, doth confesse that shee is placed as Pope (by some) next after *Leo* the fourth. *Quod si ita sic evenisset* which if it had so happened, yet because it was an error of fact, & not of right, which happeneth in the most wisest, that accident will bring no preiudice to the sea of Rome: But all thinges should be so reakoned, as if that whole two yeares wherein shee sat, the seat had bin voide. In deed wee neede not care for any good they do, whether the sea be empty or ful, it is al one; they be but painted sepulchres, and as dumbe Idols, not so good as old servitors who take their pẽsions & leaue waiting, for they did once good in their liues before their service

Geneb. l. 3. fol. 391.

Ibid. fol. 600.

Ibid. fol. 799.

Read the 6. booke of Laurentius valla his eliganties. c. 30 & Lactãt. de ira dei. c. 8. for the vse of the word valeo Ter. in Andria act. 4. scen. 2. Saund: de vis. monar. l. 7. fol. 412.

Nothinge will preiudice the sea of Rome.

vice decaied; and the Popes spende their time before they come, how to get it, and after they haue it, how to keepe it. *Alane Cope* another of that brood though fully impudent in other cases, yet is hee ashamed to deny the story absolutely, but maketh a metamorphosed or changeable excuse, which no man I trow can either disproue or proue (I speake only in skorne of his so base deuise) which is, that she might be *first a man, and after some time in the seate changed to be a woman.* The change is no more vnlikely, thã that such persons after such change should beare childrẽ vnheard of, both which be vnpossible to al men once to thinke of, saving to those seruants, who are sworne to defend such mistresses as dame *Ione* was. And thus hath he ouerthrowne the fable of *Ioan.* 8. *Quis hæc ludibria non rideat, qui habeat aliquid sanitatis, cũ videat homines velut mente captos ea serio facere, quæ si quis faciat in lusu, nimis lasciuus & ineptus esse videatur.* Who woulde not laugh saith *Lactantius*, at these trifles that hath any sparke of wit, when he shal see men doing those things in earnest, as if they were bereaued of their wits, whereas if any man should but do thẽ in sport or iest, he would be thought ouer wanton and lasciuious. But to put the matter out of doubt where *Genebrard* and some other with him do make themselues sport, (as before is said) with the word *Anglicus* and *Moguntinus*, referring them to the country, as though it should bee in doubt whether shee were an English woman or a Moguntine, it is plaine to any man not preiudiced in opinion, *Fasciculus temporum*, their owne historian saith, *Iste Ioannes Anglicus cognomine, sed natione Moguntinus.* This Ione English, by birth of Magunce in *Germanie* is said to be about these times: & was a woman disguised in mans apparell; shee had so profited in the holy scripture, that her like was scarse to be found, and was chosen to be Pope. But after being great with childe as shee went in procession shee fell in labour and died: shee was plagued of God for it (saith he) nor is shee put in the number of the Popes. *Sabellicus* an other historiographer of their own

Alanus Cope. dial. 1. pag. 47.

Lact. instit. l. 1. c. 21. fine.

Fascicu. temp. anno. 864.

Her name was Ioan English.

Sabelli. Æne. 9. l. 1. pag. 469 aut aliter 625 aut aliter 3253.

anci-

ancienter thā the laſt recited maketh mention of this Dame *Ione. Nullus defunctæ honor habitus.* There was no honour beſtowed at her burial, the report is for the remēbrance of her filthie act ſaith he. They that deſire further teſtimony herin Let them read Biſhop *Iwell* in the defence of the Apology of the church of England *part. 4. c. 1. diu. 1. fol. 380.* And *Willet* in his *Synopſis Papiſmi. contro 14. quæſt. 10. fol. 218.* Preſently after Pope *Ione* followed that vnhappy time in the ſea of Rome ſo much lamented, in ſo much that *Wernerus in Faſciculo temporum* crieth out *Heu heu domine Deus quomodo obſcuratum eſt aurum, mutatus eſt color optimus, qualia contigiſſe circa hæc tempora etiam in ſancta ſede apoſtolica quam vſq; huc tanto zelo cuſtodiſti legimus ſcandala.* Oh Lord God ſaith he, how is thy gold made darke and vnknowē. The beſt color is changed, what reproches doe we read of that happened in theſe times even to the ſea Apoſtolike which hetherto thou haſt kept with ſo great watchfulneſſe, what contentions ſtrifes, ſects, envies, ambitions, intruſions, and perſecutions hath there bin. O the very worſt time, wherin holyneſſe is wanting, & faithfulnes is fled from the ſonns of men. Thē was there a monſter with a doggs head, and members like a mā, preſented to the Emperour: And well might it (ſaith he) ſhew the deformity of that time, when as men wandred here and there without an head, as doggs run a bout barking. *Genebrard* confeſſeth that ſome hiſtorians following *Sigebert* in his Chronicles, after *Martin 2.* (of ſome called *Marinus* who got the Popedome by ill meanes) place one *Agapetus*, who was Pope one yeare; & likwiſe betweene *Adrian 3.* (who by ordinary account followed the ſaide *Martin*) and *Stephan 6.* or 5. (who ſucceeded *Adrian*) they place one *Baſill*, who as they ſay ſat 4. yeares. But we ſaith he follow *Platina*, & a great part of writers. This is that time, or neere about wherin he alſo cōfeſſeth that for 150. yeeres together to the number of about 50. Popes from *Iohn 8.* to *Leo 9.* they were *alout of order and rather Apoſtatates then Apoſtolike*, Amongſt which infamous Popes were theſe eſpe-

B. Iuell.

Andr. Willet.

Foſcicu. temp. fol. 68. a°. dom. 884. & 904.

Looke what happened in theſe times to the ſea of Rōe.

A mōſter preſented to the Emperour.

Chron. l. 4. fol 794. anno 885

For. 150 yeers o gether to the number of 50. popes they al revolted frō the faith.

especially playing their parts as it were on a stage, *Martin* 2. *Stephan*, *Formosus*, *Iohn* 9. *Sergius* 3. *Iohn* 12. *Sylvester* 2. A breife of their dealinges is this. *Formosus* being a Cardinal and a bishop was deposed and degraded by *Iohn* 8. and got him out of the citty, *swearing* he would neuer returne and become bishop againe. After the death of *Iohn* 8. *Martin* 2. absolved *Formosus* of his oath, restoring him to his former dignity, not long after *Formosus* was created bishop. *Stephan* succeeded, & being carried with a stronge hatred towardes *Formosus*, not knowing or not beleeuing that Pope *Martin* had absolued him of his oath, decreed publikly in a counsel of bishops that *Formosus* was neuer lawfull Pope, and therfore his acts to bee frustrate. This dealing displeased many & therfore 3. Popes in order *Romanus* 1. *Theodorus* 2. and especially *Iohn* 9. called an other counsel of bishops, declaring that *Formosus* was lawful Pope, and revoked the sentence of *Stephan*. But *Sergius* the thirde did in all things, as *Stephan* before him had donne. Moreouer *Stephan* tooke vp the carcasse of *Formosus* out of the graue: & cut of 3. of his fingers & cast it into the streame of Tiber, an inhumane and barbarous deed, yet may hee bee a saint in respect of some that follow after; *Iohn* 12. was a mōster of monsters for pride, whoredomes, adulteries, *symonies*, sacrileges, blasphemies, incest, murders, periuries, and such others. *Bellarmine* saith *Fuit iste Ioannes omnium pontificum ferè deterrimus*. Almost the worst of all Popes, was *Iohn* 12. *Sylvester* 2. as saith *Polidore Vergil* gat the Popedome by no good meanes, in his desire to rule, hee consulted with the diuel about the length of his life. Hee did the devil homage saith *Wernerus*. The age wherin hee liued, was an vnlearned and vngodly age saith *Bellarmine*. There is no way that I see, to safe the honour of these bishops in this sea of Rome at this time, except we will aduenture to say of these bad men, in a word, as *Euripides* did of Good, *Quæ hic mala putantur, hæc sūt in cælo bona*. Who are here reckoned for naught, are in heauen esteemed vertuous. *D. Saunders* maketh a digression, from his

Bell de Rom. pont. l. 4. c. 12.

Plat. Fasci. Sonne vnto Sergius the Pope. Platina in vit eius.

De Rom. pont. l. 2. c. 29. f. 310. Polid. Vergil. de invent. rerū l. 5. c. 8.

De Rom. pont l. 4 c. 12. fol. 535. ann. 909.

Ex lactant. l. 5. c. 16. fine de officio viri iusti

ordinary busines in hand, in excuse of the Popes advanced in these times; in devoureth to proue *that the church of Rome hath endured al manner of Tentations and in the end obtained victory* (I trow he meaneth *such a victory*, as those haue had who haue bin *overcome of evill, & sold themselues as slaues to iniquity*) First the persecution stood (saith hee) by the heathen Emperours, then by heretike Emperours, and their adherets and then by *the Popes themselues*, vnderminding that sea most of all, & doing what in them lay *to overthrowe* the church for ever. His words be these. *Tunc enim Pontifices Romani.* After (saith he) followed the Roman bishops, whose glory & ambition mouing them, carried with a desire to crosse each other, gaue manifest testimony, that no kinde of temptation was omitted, which did not indeauour to ruinate that sea. Nether without these things had that promise bin so admirably performed, in the eies of al, when it was said, *The gates of hell shall not prevaile against the Rock, set there by Christ*, whether by the gates of hell we vnderstand the tyranny of the prince of this world, or heresies, and schismes, or sinnes & lewd maners, except the seate of *Peter* had bin assaulted by all those means, whē yet it cold not be vtterly overthrown by al these But now after so many persecutions of the Emperours, after so many domesticall schismes, which *even for the sea of Rome the Popes themselues* did stirre vp and raise; after so many heresies abroad by which the sea of Rome hath bin attēpted, *tamen cathedra & successio Petri non modo aliqua est, verum etiā stat*, yet the Chaire and succession of Peter is not only somewhat, but also standeth florisheth & hetherto raigneth, whē the other Patriarchal seates are fallen, *Vnde iste honor Cathedræ Romanæ?* But whence commeth this honour to the Chaire of Rome? What, from the deserts of the Popes? I beleeue it not

Saund. de visib monar. l. 7 fol. 420. anno. 895. vsq; ad 912. Rom. 12. 21. The corruptiō and bad life of the Popes, is brought in as an argumēt to confirme the good estate of the church of Rome. is the sicknes in the head, a proofe of the bodies perfection? Here hath Bellarmine lost 2. of his principall notes of his church, that is, The agreement and kniting of the mēbers with the head. And holynes of life nether of which by their own confessiō was at Rome in those times: And yet hee maketh them notes & marks of the catholike church: and consequently of the church of Rome. Bel. de notis eccles. l. 4. c. 10. & 13. Stil the ill Popes are his best proofe of the goodnes of the church. Here by the chaire he must meane the chaire of Wood at Rome: or the people liuing there: if the first it is ridiculous: if the later we neuer doubted, but the christian people who are the church, may well stand & florish without such an head, as he hath described many of thē to be.

not (saith he) For they, although for these 800. yeeres almost they haue bin very good, yet at this present, and often afterward *they deserued very ill*, insomuch that if you look vnto the deedes of the men *it seemeth that that church should haue bin buried in perpetual oblivion*. For scarse is there any sinne (but heresie) which may bee imagined, but that sea hath bin defiled with it. And why it hath not fallen into heresie, no reasō can bee giuen but that Gods goodnesse preserueth it. For seeing heresie which is accompanied with blindnesse of hart, is neuer the first offence of any man, but a punishment of greater which had gon before; I doe not thinke that any more greivous sinns haue bin either in the seas of *Alexandria*, *Antioche*, or *Constantinople*, then in the sea of Rome. And therfore (saith he) seeing every man (even the bishopp of Rome also) is by nature a liar *even so touching his owne person*, he shall bee so accounted by me: yet God in the meane time should bee so far forth credited to bee true that wee shoulde thinke (as the matter is apparant indeed) that he hath set the seate and succession of *Peter* on a most sure rocke, on which no false doctrine ether of *Faith or manners* coulde ever allight, because Christ said to *Peter I haue prayed for thee, that thy faith faile not, &c.* Let the heretiks therfore knowe, that the more & more greiuous sinnes they produce against the bishops, our faith (saith he) doth stād the stronger. Thus farre *Saunders*; Where any man may playnly see, that if that curse denounced by the Lord in the Prophet *Esay, woe vnto them that speake good of evill, & evill of good, which put darknesse for light, & light for darknesse*, doe appertaine, or was ever directed against any, it will fall on them who build their faith one such a foundation. Againe where he saith *Omnis homo mendax etiam Romanus pontifex*, every man is a liar, yea the Pope also, his old fellow *Alphonsus a Castro* (a strong maintainer of the catholike faith as *Genebrard* calleth him) could write against heretikes such as *Luther* was, and yet say boldly *Omnis homo errare potest in fide etiam si Papa sit*. Every man may erre in the faith, yea though

An impudent lie, for hee knoweth and they all confesse Liberius was an Arriam heretike and Honorius was a Monothelite heretike, if any truste bee to bee giuen to generall coūsels, Popes, or anciēt writers.

How agreeth this concluſiō with those premises. Sciant igitur heretici. Esay 5.20.23. Every man is a liar. Saund. Every mā may er in the faith Alp. a Castro. adv. hæres. l. 1. c. 4. Fidei catholicæ propugnator. Genebrar. chr. l. 4. f. 1126. The Pope may fall into heresy.

he be Pope. For it is certaine saith hee, Pope *Liberius* was an Arrian heretike and Pope *Anastasius* favoured the Nestorias, of this whosoever hath read the histories, doth not doubt; & wheras some doe affirme that hee which erreth in the faith obstinatly, is not then Pope, & by that meanes the Pope cānot be an heretike *est in re seria verbis velle iocari*, it is to trifle with words in a serious matter, for according to that reason a man may impudently affirme, that no faithful man may erre in the faith, for when he is an heretike, he then ceaseth to be a faithfull man. Nether doe wee doubt saith he, whether *One man may bee a Pope and an heretike both together*, but this wee seeke whether a man who otherwise is subiect to erre *his pontificiall dignity* doe free him: I doe not beleeue that there is any so shameleſſe a flatterer of the Pope that he will say *he cānot erre or be deceiued*, in the interpretation of the scripture, for seeing it is certaine that many of them haue bin so vnlearned, that they haue not vnderstood their *Grammer*, how is it then, that they should interpret the holy scriptures. Thus far hath *Alphonsus* gone, if not too farre. To conclude this inference against *Saunders* it must not be forgotten, that he hath described and confessed the Pope of Rome who with him is Christs vicar, to be such an one indued with such qualities, as no honest, religious, vertuous, holy, faithfull, or good man, or any child of God or member of Christ was ever said to bee furnished with. S. *Paul* gaue to the Romās, & other churches these lessons touching the holynes of their liues. Now I beseech you bretheren, marke them diligently which cause diuisions and offences, contrary to the doctrine which he hath learned & avoid them: For they that are such serue not the Lord Iesus Christ but their owne bellies, & with faire speech and flattering deceaue the harts of the simple. Walke wisely towards them that are without, and redeeme the time, Let your speech be gracious alwaise and powdred with salt; that you may knowe how to answere everie man, Let the peace of God rule in your harts, to the which yee are called in one body.

The pontifical dignity cānot priviledg him who is otherwise subiect to erre.

S. Paule to the Rom. c. 16. 17.

Colloss. 4. 5. 6. Cap. 3. 15.

and be yee gracious. Abstaine from all apparance of evill. And of himselfe who was a teacher he saith, Wee command you brethern in the name of the Lord Iesus Christ, that yee withdraw your selues from every brother that walketh inordinatly, and not after the instruction which hee receaued of vs; for yee your selues knowe, how yee ought to follow vs for we behaued not our selues inordinatly amongst you. And to the Hebrewes he writeth thus, Obey them that haue the oversight of you, and submit your selues, for they watch for your soules, as they that must giue accompts that they may doe it with ioy and not with greife, for that is vnprofitable for you, pray for vs for wee are assured that wee haue a good conscience in all things, desiring to like honestly. Now since it is no particular conceipt but a matter of sound consequēce that all duties are by so much the better performed, by how much the men are more religious from whose abilities the same proceed, Godlinesse being the cheifest top and well-spring of al true vertues, even as God is of all good things, howe is it possible that these Popes and church of Rome should hold and keepe Christs regency here on earth, to cōmand and appoint lawes and statutes to all Christians, and Christian churches; and be as it were, a communalty free frō all error, at least of doctrine, claiming from a text of scripture which requireth not only a not fayling in faith, but a strēgthning of their brethren that shal slide: when they themselues in the meane while shal be a company faithlesse, irreligious and vniust, yea a lothsome distressed number divorced from al piety, religion, and godlines. Is this the stone that S. *Peter* ment, when he said, recording the wordes of the Prophet Esay, *Behold I put in Sion a chiefe corner stone, elect and precious, & he that beleeveth therein shal not be ashamed. A stone to stumble at, and rocke of offence, even to them that stumble at the word beeing disobedient*, as *Bellarmine* implieth where he saith, *quanquā hæc verba in Christum præcipue conuenire non ignoramus, eadem tamen non inepte in Christi vicarium quadrare censemus*, although we

2. Thess. 3. 6.

Cap. 13. 17. 18.

Hooker eccles. poll. 5. para. 1. Nullū ego cōsilium melius arbitror, quā si exemplo tuo fratrem docere studeas, quę oporteat, quæ non oporteat fieri, prouocans cum ad meliora, & cōsulens ei, non verbo, neque lingua, sed opere & veritate. Bern. de adu. domini. serm. 3.

1. Peter. 2. 6. 8. Esay. 28. 16. & 8. 14.

Bellar. in præf. in lib. de Rom. pont. fo. 10. 11.

About the yere 1058. In Fasc. temp. Benedict was Pope 9. mōths and after expulsed and throwen out. Iohn 10. hee that entereth not by the dore is a theif & a robber. Gregory 7. Benno in vita eius. If nothing bee in the Chalice but the blood of Christ, how could poisō be mingled with it? Geneb. Chro. l. 4. fol. 887. A schisme 29. yeeres. For the full truth of the history of Hēry 4. Emperor & Gregory 7. Pope reade the dialogues of my Lord Winton. p. 3. f. 430. &c. The counsells accused him of all those vices that Cardinall Benno did.

are not ignorant that those wordes are principally meant of Christ, yet we do not thinke amisse whē we say that they do belong also to Christs vicar the Pope. A horrible blasphemy, if ever there were any. But I will leaue this and turne to their successiō againe. *Leo.* 9. being the last I mentioned, I am come vnto the yere 1058. about which time I finde an other troublesome accompt Victor 2. *Stephan* 10. or 9. *Benedict.* 9. or 10. and *Nicholas* 2. Touching which *Benedict*, *Genebrard* confesseth that by some he is not reakoned for any Pope, yet doth he retaine him: *Wernerus* saith, hee gate the Popedome by force, and after 9. monethes gaue it over. *Sanders* in his catalogue hath him not. *Platina* deliuereth touching this *Benedict* that by the meane of one *Hildebrand* (who afterward came to be Pope,) he was expulsed, because he entred not by the dore (as the Gospel speaketh) but by *force*, & *bribery*, so much also doth *Onuphrius* confesse, who would not haue him reakoned, yet doth *Platina* first, and *Genebrard* after, put him into the number. The table which you haue omitteth him. By this time there had bin 14. schismes, in the Church of Rome. Within a few yeeres after followed *Gregory*, 7. and *Victor*. 3. The former of which two is accused by Cardinal *Benno*, one of the same Church and time with him, to be an heretike, a necromoncer, a seditious person, and an adulterer. The later of them was poisoned in the Chalice, by meanes of the Emperour *Henry* 4. as saith *Platina* & *Genebrard*. *Genebrard* speaketh of a schisme in Rome about the yere 1080. which lasted 29. yeeres, and happened thus. *Rodulph* the duke of *Suevia* being slaine, who was chosen Emperor by certain princes of *Germany* at the perswasiō of the Pope; *Hēry* the Emperor in a counsel holden at *Brixia* by th bishoppes of *Italie*, *Lumbardie* and *Germanie* purged him selfe of those matters vvhich the Pope laid against him, & laid them to his holines charge and brought in Gilbert Archbishop of Ravenna to be Pope who was called *Clemens* 3. who sat 17. yeares or as some reckō 21. and yet is now cleane left out. And here againe doth *Ge-*

ne-

nebrard deplore the miserable estate of the Church of Rome then. After this, about the yeare 1130. There was one *Anacletus* 2. otherwise called *Peter* who by certaine Cardinalls was chosen Pope in a schisme against *Innocentius* 2, and obtained the place 7. yeares, after his death *Victor* 4. was created by Cardinalls of his owne faction, who when hee had sat certaine monthes gaue it over to *Innocentius* by the perswasion of S. *Bernard*, in compounding of which schisme hee laboured seauen yeares. Then followed *Celestinus* 2. he was the first created Pope without any voice or allowance of the people, according as the lawe of *Innocentius* had ordained, by which law the people was wholy excluded from any assembly which concerned the Popes, & the election of them was altogether in the Cardinals, and by little & little the cheife of the clergy were also debarred, and the choise was fitted to the colledge of Cardinalls. Little more then 16. yeares after *Genebrard* telleth vs of an other greate schisme which lasted 20. yeares betweene one *Octauianus* who was called *Victor*. 4. against *Alexander* 3. which fel (saith he) by meanes of a division amongst the Cardinals who were of the Emperours faction: Here hath *Genebrard* cast in a word, but it is a worde of vntruth, for he told vs a little before that the Electiō was wholy brought into the Cardinals hands even where they desired it. And *Victor* being dead *Calixtus* 3. continued the schisme and sate almost 6. yeeres, and then after the death of *Calixtus*, *Paschalis* 3. called before *Iohannes* was by certain Cardinals chosen Pope, but at length he was commaunded by *Fredericke* the Emperour to renounce the seate, and so the schisme ended, after he had sate seavē yeres, by this it rather appeareth that the Emperor pacified the schisme, thā that he animated it. In these times, were the factions of the *Gibellines*, and *Gelphes* in Italie brandishing their swordes, the *Gibellines* taking part with the Emperor *Fredericke*, (who was

A great schism which lasted 7 years was takē vp by S. Bernard. ao. 1138. Geneb. l. 4. fo. 918. Fasc. tēp.

The Cardinals got the sole election of the Pope into their handes anno. 1144. Geneb. ibid. & 932. an. 1159.

Alexander 3. pontifex contra quem sedebant.

Victor 1.
Calixtus 2.
Pascalis 3.

What faction had the Emperor, when for 1000. yeares after Christ, the bishop of Rome coulde not be chosen without the Princes consent.

The Gibellines were of the familie of the Columes & the Gelphs were of the familie of the Vrsines.

Frederick. 2. The Empire was void by meanes of his deposition 28. yeeres, Geneb. Chro. l. 4. fol. 967. & 974.

thrice

thrice excomunicated by *Gregorie 9.*) & the *Gelphes* with the Popes. They wasted that country the space of 260. yeares. They began vnder *Alexander* 3. in the yeere 1160. & so continued vntil anno 1420. This dealing on the Popes side, may rather beseeme S. *Paules* sworde then S. *Peters* keies; I haue now no memorable thinge to speake of vntil I come to the rule of *Boniface* 8. He caled himselfe Lord of the whole world aswell in temporall things as in spirituall. Hee instituted the yeare of *Grace* or *Iubile*, from 100. yeeres to an 100. and caused the first to begin in the yeere 1300. This is he of whome it is said *He entred like a fox, hee raigned like a lion, hee died like a dogge.* A while after followed 7. Popes in order *Clemens* 5. *Iohn* 21. or 22. or as *Genebrard* saith 23. *Benedict* 12, *Clemens* 6. *Innocentius* 6. *Urbanus* 5. & *Gregory* 11. which seaven were al none residence and never came at Rome, but abode in France, as saith *Bellarmine*. This *Iohn* here mentioned (whether the 21. 22. or 23.) held an absolute and grosse error which is, *That the soules of the blessed see not God vntil the last day.* A while after these began the hottest & most greiuous schisme that ever the Church of Rome endured, it continued as some of them write 50. yeeres, as some 40. as some 30. and as some aboue al these 52. In so much that learned & quiet men could not tel to which side to leane. It held with great slaunder to the Clergy, and hurt of soules, in respect of heresies & other errors, which then began to bud, because there was no discipline in the church against such. And therefore during the times of *Vrbanus* 6. (who was next to *Gregory* 11.) and *Bonifacius the* 9. *Innocentius*, 7. *Gregory* 12. *Benedict* 13. *Alexander* 5. *Iohn* 23. (or after some 22. or 24.) and *Martin* 5. no man can tell who was the lawfull and vndoubted Pope as saith *Wernerus*. To appease the confusion of which time, the counsel of Constance was gathered in *Germanie* *Iohn* the 23. being president at the beginning: whereat was present the Emperour *Segismundus*:) against the schisme of the three Popes that then were, *Iohn* 23. sate at *Bononia*, *Gregory* the 12. at *Ari-*

Boniface. 8. a°. 1294. Intrauit vt vulper, regnauit vt leo, mortuus est canis. Geneb. l. 4. f. 1000 Fascicul. temp. fol. 83. De Rom. pont. l. 2. c. 1.

Iohn 22. held an error. Geneb. l. 4. fol. 1045. an. dom. 1378. It was ended vnder Martin 5. about the yeare 1417.

In Fasc. temp. fol. 86. 2. The President of the counsel was throwen out. Geneb. l. 4 fol. 1059.

viminum, and *Benedict.* 13. in Spaine; which three were quite throwne out, and *Martin.* 5. elected the vndoubted Pope. *Iohn*, was accused in that counsel, as *denying the life everlasting and the resurrection of the flesh.* It is answered, hee was not the lawful & true Pope because there were 3. at that time, whose factions had al great favorites, and learned advouchers. The counsel pronounced of him that he was a *sinke of sins*, a devill incarnate. *Bellarmine* cõfesseth there were 53. articles proved against him, and that he was of so lewd a life, as though hee had beleeued there should be no iudgment hereafter. But see the mischiefe; This councel of Constance that thus condemned and threw out the Pope, condemned also *Iohn Husse* (a good Christiã) for an hereticke. In that, they extol & receiue the counsel, in renouncing the Pope they do not: *Husse* had the Emperours safe conduct to come and goe freely to the counsel; but the bishops nothing regarding the Emperours warrant overthrew the deed and put him to death, who put himselfe into their hands; *Cæsar obsignavit, Christianus orbis resignauit, maior Cæsare.* The Emperor signed the warrant, (saith *Campion*) but the Counsel disanulled it; who is greater than the Emperour. To saue the credit of this counsel for dealing against *Husse* and the Pope too, *Bellarmine* hath deuised a quadruple partition of the allowing or disallowing of counsels by them. 1. he mẽtioneth generall Coũcels which he *alloweth.* then general coũcels which he disaloweth. 3. he hath sõe coũsels, which are *partly* to be *allowed*, & *partly* to be *disallowed.* of which last sort of the coũsel of *Constãce* with him. For (saith he) touching the first sessiõs wher they did enact that *a generall coũsel should be aboue the Pope*, it is to be disalowed: But in respect of the last sessiõs, & those things which Pope *Martin* 5. alowd, it is receued by al Catholiks? But what saith the Poet, *Vide, auaritia quid facit?* see what covetousnes cã do: no. *Vide, impudentia quid facit*, see what impudẽcy cã do. Are they not a shãed of this, now that they fle their own Pops & their own coũsels. Let vs now see how the forme of that Church stood

The had christ neuer a vicar at that time. Lib. de Rom. Pont. l. 1. c. 14. Counsel of Constance. Camp. ratio 4. de concilijs. The counsell vndid, what the Emperour confirmed. Bellar. de cõc. & eccesl. l. c. 5. 6. 7. Why doth Bellarmine giue vs such a distinctiõ of coũsells which none of his fellowes ever did, but because hee hath one deuise which they never thought of. Ter. in Phor. act. 2. scen. 2. non te horum pudet, at si talentum rẽ reliquisset decem primus esses memoriter progeniẽ vestram vsq; ab avo atq; atavo proferens,

The counsell of Basill deposed Pope Eugenius.

after *Martin* 5. to whom succeeded *Eugenius* 4. against who was chosen by the Counsel of Bazil one Fœlix 5. called before *Amadæus* Duke of *Savoy*, which *Felix* after hee had sitte 9. yeres, did freely giue it over againe. Then there was a new schisme began, the cause was *whether the Pope were abone a generall counsell, or a counsell aboue the Pope*. These times were so miserable touching their Popes and Church that of CONSCIENS which before that time was somewhat, the two first syllables were abated and only ENS stocks and blocks left to governe the *spowse* of Christ, which is his church. This cousel of Bazil is reakoned by *Bellarmine* amongst those which are partly allowed, and partly disallowed: And yet *Sanders* absolutely condemneth it as vnlawful for offering to depose *Eugenius*, and therfore (saith he) it gaue occasion of a great schisme. *Albertus Pighius* with one breath concludeth that both those counsels of *Constance and Basill concludeth both against order and nature, against the cleere light of the Gospell and against all antiquity, and against the Catholike church. Caietane* is much busied also with the credit of those two counsels, the one confirming the decrees of the other, he seareth to call that of Constãce a general or Oecumenical counsel because it subiected the Pope to a councell, and so opened a gappe which should haue bin shut. *Andradius* is resolute, that the counsel was generall and may be so reakoned, and interpreteth it, not as if they had decreed simply that the Pope should be subiected to a councel in general, but onlie *when they rend and teare Church* by dissention, and making of parts to get the popedome as then they did, then for a generall councel to be stickler amongst them is not amisse. The testimony of these men before-prized, what shal we say to those, who do obtrude both these Councels of Constance and Bazil vnto vs not only in matters of fact, touching the cõdemning of *Iohn Hosse* and *Ierome of Prage*, but also in matters of doctrine & faith, & in no smal matters nether, but for proofe of their masse, and the denying of the Laity, the vse of the cup.

Fasc. temp. fol. 89.

Conscientia. Conscience. Solumentia sponsã Christi gubernare videmus.

Sand. de visib. monar. l. 7. fol. 516.

Eccles. hierar. l. 6. c. 2. fo. 402.

In opusc. Caiet. de author pap. & conc. c. 8. in princ.

Defenc. Trid. Conc. l. 2. fol. 428, 429.

The shephard renteth & teareth the flock. Now they praise those 2. councels. vnto vs.

Hard. cont. Iuell twise in the 2. artic. for the communion in on kind.

cup in the Lords supper, & that without any manner of scruple or doubt of the authority and credit of them (whereof their former fellows do dispute) but as if their decrees, were the perfect & sound oracles of Gods vniversal church, agreeing with the sacred and holy scripture. They are in this like to those friendes in *Horace* who though they studied all one thing, yet they did chuse a diverse kinde of life. And so the Poet biddeth the lovers of the Coūtry life, to salut the lovers of the citty life, and though in that they were much vnlike; yet in other things they were even twins. So must *Andradius*, *Harding*, *Allen*, *Canus*, shake hands with *Pighius*, *Sanders*, and *Caietane*, *Bellarmine* crying aime, and fully consenting with neither. But to go forward from *Eugenius* 4. last mentioned, there are none memorable vntil wee come to *Alexander* 6. vnto whom these succeeded; *Pius* 3. *Iulius* 2. *Leo* 10. *Adrianus* 6. *Clemens* 7. *Paulus* 3. *Iulius* 3. *Marcellus* 2. *Paulus* 4. *Pius* 4. *Pius* 5. *Gregorie* 13. *Sextus* 5. *Urbanus* 7. *Gregory* 14. *Innocentius* 9. And *Clemens* 8. now 2. yeers since dead. For *Alexander* 6. I finde no wordes aunswerable to his wickednesse; an Oratour may holde a scroule in his hande and not speake, beeing astonied to thinke what an husbande the spouse of Christ had all the while he liued, *vincit efficinm lingua sceleris magnitudo* saith *Lactantius*, the waight of the mischeife kept the tongue silent. He excelled in al kinde of wickednesse & mischeife; he had many bastards, one he made Duke of Valence, who was called *Cæsar Borgia*, whome hee intended to haue made Lord of al Italy. Read of him and his villanies in their owne Italian historie of *Guictiardine*. His sonne & himselfe died of the same poisoned wine, which was prepared for certaine Cardinals, such a serpent held the seat of Peter 10. yeares, til his owne poison killed him. *Iulius* 2. was a notable warrior, he moued warre against the Lords of Bonony, Perusium, and the land about, against the *Venetians*, Duke of Ferarra, the state of Genua, and the French king, and therfore as his owne parasite saith of him, Hee was more honourable in

Allen for the Masse de euch. sacrif. l. 2. fol. 558. & l. 1. c. 21. fol. 343.

Canus loc. theol. lib. 12. fol. 416.

Sand. de visib. monar. l. 8. c. 10. For the Church of Romes credit.

Andrad Orth. explic. l. 7. fol. 615.

Horace epist. l. 1. ad Fuscum. Arist. Vrbis amatorem Fuscum salvere iubemus ruris amatores: hac in re scilicet vna multū dissimiles ad cætera penè gemelli.

The residue downe to our time.

Alexander. 6. father vnto Cæsar Borgia Duke of Valence.

L. 6. c. 23.

L. 3. & 6.

Geneb. chron. l. 4. fol. 1097.

Bellica gloria quam pontificia clarior.

in warlike proweſſe, than in biſhoplike practiſe. For the reſt that follow from *Iulius* 2. to *Clemens* 8. the times are yet too young for vs to know any memorable act of theirs, they who come after vs, ſhall peradventure, haue their dealings alſo brought to light. Thus much at laſt I would haue you to remember, That *Pius* the fift, and *Gregory* the thirteenth, two of the laſt recited Popes did mightily bend themſelues againſt Queene *Elizabeth* of bleſſed memory, & againſt the whole nobility and commons of the Realme by *excommunicating of her perſon, and abſolving of her ſubiects from their oath and obedience, and expoſed the realme and ſtate to ſtrangers as a pray, as much as in them lay.* But the great God *Iehova*, who her Maieſtie did alwaies ſerue in ſincerity and truth gaue her *health, peace, and life*, to ſee the decay not only of them two, but of a litter of fowre more, whoſe ends ſhee ſaw, and the ſeaventh in beeing when God called her highneſſe to her bleſſed ſleep. Thus *Tuberius* haue I run over many hiſtories in briefe, to giue you a taſte both howe the ſucceſſion and chaire of Rome hath ſtood, as alſo a touch of the *faith, life, honeſty* and *manners* of the men in the Chare, for theſe 1600. yeeres; yet you muſt not think that I haue ſaid the hundred part, which might be by ſome others followed touching the inlarging of every thing whereof I haue diſcourſed: And touching the former part of our conference which was concerning ſome points of religion, do but view them againe, and conſider their manner of handling them, by many falſhoodes and ſleights, weakneſſe in arguments, & diſſentiō one amongſt an other, and there is no queſtion, but you will giue iudgement againſt them, and ſettle your perſwaſion with vs: becauſe they themſelues haue ſet it downe for a ruled caſe, that *whereſoever there is any craft, ſleight, ſhifte, obliquity, or in any one point a manifeſt lie, there cannot be the ſimplicitie of trueth*; And that there is ſuch with them let him that wil not beleeue me firſt view their bookes, & then confute. I pray God that you may make ſuch vſe of my labour herein as I wiſh and I know the

Reade the anſwere vnto a ſeditious Bull ſent into England by Pius 5. anno dom. 1569. by Iohn Iuell late biſhop of Salisbury, in the 12 yeare of her Maieſties raigne.

Regnum Angliæ proſcriptiſt, prædæq; expoſuit, Geneb. chron. l. 4 fol. 1169.

God let queen Elizabeth ſee 7. of her enimies Popes of Rome alive & dead viz. Pius 5. Gregory 13. Sixtus. 5. Vrbanus 7. Gregory 14. Innocentius 9 Clemens 8.

the trueth of it doth deſerue.

Tuberius I thanke you much for your paines, but more for your ſo well wiſhing vnto me. God I hope will incline my hearte to the apprehenſion of the truth of your diſcourſe herein. And ſo fare you well.

23 AP 57

The names of the Bishops or Popes of Rome for these 1600. yeeres according to the vsuall account.

S. Peter.
Lynus.
Cletus.
Clemens.
Anacletus.
Euaristus.
Alexander.
Sixtus.
Telesphorus.
Higinus.
Pius.
Anicetus.
Soter.
Eleutherius.
Victor.
Zepherinus.
Calixtus.
Vrbanus.
Pontianus.
Anterus.
Fabianus.
Cornelius.
Lucius.
Stephanus.
Sixtus. 2.
Dionisius.
Felix.
Eutichianus.
Caius.
Marcellinus.
the first 300. yeeres.
Marcellus.
Eusebius.
Melchiades.
Silvester.
Marcus.
Iulius.
Liberius.
Felix 2.
Damasus.
Sisicius.
Anastasius.
Innocentius.
Sozomus.
Bonifacius.
Celestinus.
Sixtus. 3.
Leo.
Hillarius.
Simplicius.
Felix. 3.
Gelacius.
Anastatius. 2.
Symmachus.
Hormisda.
Iohannes.
Felix. 4.
Bonifacius. 2.
Iohannes. 2.
Agapetus.
Silverius.
Vigilius.
Pelagius.
Iohannes. 3.
Benedictus.
Pelagius. 2.
Gregorius.
the next 300. yeeres.
Sabinianus.
Bonifacius. 3.
Bonifacius. 4.
Deus dedit.
Bonifacius. 5.
Honorius.
Severinus.
Iohannes. 4.
Theodorus.
Martinus.
Eugenius.
Vitalianus.
Adeodatus.
Domnus.
Agatho.
Leo. 2.
Benedictus. 2.
Iohannes. 5.
Cuno.
Sergius.
Iohannes. 6.
Iohannes. 7.
Sisinnius.
Constantinus.
Gregory. 2.
Gregorius. 3.
Zacharias.
Stephanus. 2.
Stephanus. 3.
Paulus.
Stephanus. 4.
Adrianus.
Leo. 3.
Stephanus. 5.
Paschalis.
Eugenius. 2.
Valentinus.
Gregorius. 4.
Sergius. 2.
Leo. 4.
Benedictus. 3.
Nicholaus.
in the yeere 858.
Adrianus. 2.
Ioannes. 8.
Martinus. 2.
Adrianus. 3.
Stephanus. 6.
Formosus.
Bonifacius. 6.
Stephanus. 7.
Romanus.

Theo-

Theodorus 2.
Ioannes 9.
Benedictus 4.
Leo 5.
Christophorus
Sergius 3.
Anastasius 3.
Lando.
Ioannes 10.
Leo 6.
Stephanus 8.
Ioannes 9.
Leo 7.
Stephanus 9.
Martinus 3.
Agapetus 2.
Ioannes 12.
Leo 8.
Ioannes 13.
Domnus 2.
Benedictus 5.
Banifacius 7.
Benedictus 6.
Ioannes 14.
Ioannes 15.
Ioannes 16.
Gregory 5.
Sylucster 2.
Ioannes 17.
now are wee come to the 1000. yeere.
Ioannes 18.
Sergius 4.
Benedictus 7.
Ioannes 19.
Benedictus 8.
Gregorius 6.
Clemens 2.
Damasus 2.
Leo 9.
Victor 2.
Stephanus 10.
Nicolaus 2.
Alexander 2.
Gregorius 7.
Victor, 3.
Vrbanus, 2.
Paschalis, 2.
Gelasius, 2.
Calixtus, 2.
Honorius, 2.
Innocentius, 2.
Celestinus, 2.
Lucius, 2.
Eugenius, 3.
Anastagius, 4.
Adrianus, 4.
Alexander, 3.
Lucius, 3.
Vrbanus, 3.
Gregorius, 8.
Clemens, 3.
Celestinus, 3.
Innocentius, 3.
Honorius, 3.
Gregorius, 9.
Celestinus, 4.
Innocentius, 4.
Alexander, 4.
Clemens, 4.
Gregory, 10.
Innocentius, 5.
Adrianus, 5.
Ioannes, 20.
Nicolaus, 3.
Martinus, 4.
Honorius, 4.
Nicolaus, 4.
Celestinus.
Bonifacius, 8.
Benedictus, 9.
Clemens, 5.
Ioanner, 22.
Benedictus, 10.
Clemens, 6.
Innocentius, 6.
Vrbanus, 5.
Gregorius, 11.
Vrbanus, 6.
Bonifacius, 9.
Innocentius, 7.
Gregorius, 12.
Alexander, 5.
Ioannes, 23.
Martinus, 5.
Eugenius, 4.
Nicholaus, 5.
Calixtus, 3.
Pius, 2.
Paulus, 2.
Sixtus, 4.
Innocentius, 8.
Alexãder, 6.
heere wee are come well neere to the 1500 yere.
Pius, 3.
Iulius, 2.
Leo, 10.
Adrianus, 6.
Clemens, 7.
Paulus, 3.
Iulius, 3.
Marcellus, 2.
Paulus, 4.
Pius, 4.
Pius, 5.
Gregory, 13.
Sixtus, 5.
Vrbanus, 7.
Gregory, 14.
Innocentius, 9.
Clemens, 8.

23 AP 57

FINIS.